

38-EC-J16-SB63-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

63

加州眾議員
CARLOS "CRUCK" TAYLOR
 Party Preference: Republican
 Administrator / Minister / Educator
 卡洛爾斯「泰克」泰勒
 政黨傾向：共和黨
 行政人員/牧師/教育工作者

Party Preference: Green / Environmental Healing Consultant 政黨傾向：綠黨 / 環境治療顧問	PAMELA ELIZONDO 帕米拉·埃利松多
Party Preference: None / Social Entrepreneur 政黨傾向：沒有 / 社會公益創業者	SCOTT A. VINEBERS 司格特·A·文尼貝斯
Party Preference: Democratic / Small Business Owner 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 小企業主	STEVE STOKES 史蒂夫·斯托克斯
Party Preference: Republican / Small Businessman / Mediator 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 小企業主 / 調解人	DUF SUNDHEIM 達夫·桑德海姆
Party Preference: None / Author 政黨傾向：沒有 / 作家	LING LING SHI 凌玲·史
Party Preference: Democratic / California Congresswoman 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 加州眾議員	LORETTA L. SANCHEZ 羅雷塔·L·桑切斯
Party Preference: Republican / Attorney / Businessman / Rancher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 律師 / 企業家 / 牧場主	PHIL WYMAN 菲爾·威曼
Party Preference: Republican / Health Care Lawyer 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 醫療律師	JARRELL WILLIAMSON 賈雷爾·威廉森
Party Preference: Republican / Business Attorney / Author 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 商業律師 / 作家	THOMAS G. DEL BECCARO 托馬斯·G·德貝卡羅
Party Preference: Republican / Entrepreneur / Writer / Publisher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 創業者 / 作家 / 出版商	RON LINZ 羅恩·林茲
Party Preference: Republican / Businessman / Attorney / CPA 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 企業家 / 律師 / 註冊會計師	GREG CONLON 格雷格·康隆
Party Preference: None 政黨傾向：沒有	JASON KRAUS 傑森·克勞斯
Party Preference: Republican / Retired 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 退休人士	DON KRAMPE 唐·克朗皮
Party Preference: Libertarian / Community Organizer 政黨傾向：自由黨 / 社區組織者	MARK MATTHEW HERD 馬克·馬修·赫德

Vote both sides of ballot
 請在選票兩面投票

BT: 19 - E/C - C1

C1-2A1-NC

OFFICIAL BALLOT

(NPP) DEMOCRATIC PARTY BALLOT

Consolidated Presidential Primary Election
City and County of San Francisco
June 7, 2016

Makukuha ang balotang ito sa wikang Filipino
Sa pamamagitan ng koreo: tumawag sa (415) 554-4310
Nang persnang magtanong sa manggagawa sa lugar ng botohan

Esta boleta está disponible en español

Por correo: llame al (415) 554-4366
En persona: pregunte a un trabajador electoral

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

- Complete the arrow pointing to your choice, as shown in the picture.
- If you make a mistake, you may request a new ballot.
- To vote for a qualified write-in candidate who is not listed on the ballot, write the person's name on the blank line at the end of the candidate list and complete the arrow.



Party-Nominated Offices.

Only voters who disclosed a preference upon registering to vote for the same party as the candidate seeking the nomination of any party for the Presidency or election to a party committee may vote for that candidate at the primary election, unless the party has adopted a rule to permit non-party voters to vote in its primary elections.

Voter-Nominated and Nonpartisan Offices.

All voters, regardless of the party preference they disclosed upon registration, or refusal to disclose a party preference, may vote for any candidate for a voter-nominated or nonpartisan office. The party preference, if any, designated by a candidate for a voter-nominated office is selected by the candidate and is shown for the information of the voters only. It does not imply that the candidate is nominated or endorsed by the party or that the party approves of the candidate. The party preference, if any, of a candidate for a nonpartisan office does not appear on the ballot.

政黨提名職位。

除非該黨另訂規則允許無黨派選民參加其初選投票，否則只有選民在登記投票時披露的政黨傾向與正尋求其政黨的總統提名或政黨委員會選舉之候選人相同，才可在此選中為該候選人投票。

選民提名職位和非黨派職位。

所有選民，不論在登記時披露政黨傾向或謝絕表態，均可投票給選民提名職位或是非黨派職位的任何候選人。如果選民提名職位的候選人表明政黨傾向，這是該候選人的個人選擇，而且僅提供作為選民參考。它並非表示候選人受到該政黨提名或舉名支持，也不代表候選人受到該政黨認可。選票上的非黨派職位不會列出候選人的政黨傾向（若有）。

正式選票

民主黨選票
聯合總統初選
三藩市市縣
2016年6月7日

選民指南：

- 將指向您的選擇的箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來，如圖所示。
- 如果填寫錯誤，您可以要求一份新的選票。
- 如果想要投票某個未列在選票上的合格補寫候選人，在候選人名單未提供的空位上填寫此人的姓名並將箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來。

PARTY-NOMINATED OFFICES

政黨提名職位

FEDERAL
聯邦

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

美國總統

Presidential Preference
選擇總統候選人

Vote for One / 選一名

ROQUE DE LA FUENTE 洛基·德拉富恩特	↓
HILLARY CLINTON 希拉里·克林顿	↓
HENRY HEWES 亨利·赫威斯	↓
KEITH JUDD 基思·贾德	↓
MICHAEL STEINBERG 迈克尔·斯坦伯格	↓
BERNIE SANDERS 伯尼·桑德斯	↓
WILLIE WILSON 威利·威尔逊	↓
	↓
	↓

Vote both sides of ballot
請在選票兩面投票

BT: 19 - E/C - C1

(2A1)-NC



C1-101-1-DNPPC

CH/N-DEM 1

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES 選民提名職位	
FEDERAL / 聯邦	
UNITED STATES SENATOR / 美國參議員 Vote for One / 選一名 Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 / 教師 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 教師 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 律師/工程師 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 律師/工程師 Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 / 加州司法部長 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 加州司法部長 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 國際發展促進人 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 國際發展促進人 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 自由職業者 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 自由職業者 Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 / 環境工程師 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 環境工程師 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 航太工廠工人 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 航太工廠工人 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 訓練員/操作員 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 訓練員/操作員 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 木匠/企業家/創業者 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 木匠/企業家/創業者 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / 專科治療師 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 專科治療師 Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨 Party Preference: Peace and Freedom / 和平自由黨 / 鄰里委員會委員 政黨傾向: 和平自由黨 / 鄰里委員會委員 Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 / 教育工作者 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 教育工作者 Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 / 物業經理 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 物業經理 Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 / 互聯網行銷公司執行長 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 互聯網行銷公司執行長 Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨 Party Preference: Libertarian / 自由黨 / 退休註冊護士 政黨傾向: 自由黨 / 退休註冊護士 Party Preference: None / 無黨派 / Stay-at-home Dad / Attorney 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 家庭父親/律師	VON HOUO 馮·胡戈 JASON HANANIA 傑森·哈尼亞尼亞 KAMALA D. HARRIS 卡瑪拉·D·哈里斯 GAR MYERS 加勒·邁耶斯 PAUL MERRITT 保羅·梅里特 MASSIE MUNROE 瑪西·門羅 ELEANOR GARCIA 艾麗諾·加西亞 TIM GILDERSLEEVE 蒂姆·吉爾德斯利夫 CLIVE GREY 克萊夫·格雷 DON J. GRUNDMANN 唐·J·格蘭德曼 PRESIDENT CRISTINA GRAPPO 普雷斯汀·格拉波 HERBERT G. PETERS 赫伯特·G·彼得斯 TOMI PALZER 湯姆·帕爾澤 JOHN THOMPSON PARKER 約翰·湯普森·帕克 KAREN ROSEBERRY 卡倫·羅斯伯里 EMORY RODGERS 艾莫利·羅德格斯 GEORGE C. YANG 喬治·C·楊 JERRY J. LAWS 傑利·J·勞斯 GAIL K. LIGHTFOOT 蓋爾·K·萊特福特 MIKE BEITKS 邁克·貝特克斯

FEDERAL 聯邦	
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 美國眾議員 DISTRICT 14 / 第14選區 Vote for One / 選一名 JACKIE SPEIER 傑基·斯皮爾 Party Preference: Democratic 政黨傾向: 民主黨	STATE 州
STATE SENATOR 州參議員 DISTRICT 11 / 第11選區 Vote for One / 選一名 JANE KIM 金貞妍 Party Preference: Democratic 政黨傾向: 民主黨 SCOTT WIENER 威爾遜 Party Preference: Democratic 政黨傾向: 民主黨 KEN LOO 盧維強 Party Preference: Republican 政黨傾向: 共和黨	MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 州眾議員 DISTRICT 19 / 第19選區 Vote for One / 選一名 PHIL TING 丁立立 Party Preference: Democratic 政黨傾向: 民主黨

38-EC-J18-SB67-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

67

加州選民
CARLOS "CHUCK" TAYLOR
Party Preference: Republican
Administrator / Minister / Educator
卡洛斯「查克」泰勒
政黨傾向：共和黨
行政人員 / 牧師 / 教育工作者

Party Preference: Green / Environmental Healing Consultant 政黨傾向：綠黨 / 環境治療顧問	PAMELA ELIZONDO 帕米拉·埃利松多
Party Preference: None / Social Entrepreneur 政黨傾向：沒有 / 社會公益創業家	SCOTT A. VINBERG 司格特·A·文因伯格
Party Preference: Democratic / Small Business Owner 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 小企業主	STEVE STOKES 史蒂夫·斯托克斯
Party Preference: Republican / Small Businessman / Mediator 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 小企業主 / 調解人	DUP BLANKHEIM 迪夫·布蘭克海姆
Party Preference: None / Author 政黨傾向：沒有 / 作家	LING LING SHI 凌凌·史
Party Preference: Democratic / California Congressman 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 聯邦眾議員	LORETTA L. SANCHEZ 羅雷塔·L·桑切斯
Party Preference: Republican / Attorney / Businessman / Rancher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 律師 / 企業家 / 牧場主	PHIL WYMAN 菲爾·威曼
Party Preference: Republican / Health Care Lawyer 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 醫療保健律師	JARRELL WILLIAMSON 賈雷爾·威廉森
Party Preference: Republican / Business Attorney / Author 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 商業律師 / 作家	THOMAS G. DEL BECCARO 托馬斯·G·德貝卡羅
Party Preference: Republican / Entrepreneur / Writer / Publisher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 創業家 / 作家 / 出版商	RON UNZ 羅恩·尤恩茲
Party Preference: Republican / Businessman / Attorney / CPA 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 企業家 / 律師 / 註冊會計師	GREG COMLON 格雷格·康隆
Party Preference: None 政黨傾向：沒有	JASON KRAUS 傑森·克羅斯
Party Preference: Republican / Retired 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 退休人士	DON KRAMPE 唐·克拉姆佩
Party Preference: Libertarian / Community Organizer 政黨傾向：自由黨 / 社區組織者	MARK MATTHEW HERD 馬克·馬修·赫德

Vote both sides of ballot
請在選票兩面投票

BT-19 - E/C - C1

C1-2A1-NC

OFFICIAL BALLOT

(NPP) LIBERTARIAN PARTY

BALLOT

Consolidated Presidential Primary Election
City and County of San Francisco
June 7, 2016

Makukuha ang balotang ito sa wikang Filipino
Sa pamamagitan ng Koreo: tumawag sa (415) 554-4310
Nang personal na magtanong sa manggagawa sa lugar ng botohan

Esta boleta está disponible en español

Por correo: llame al (415) 554-4366
En persona: pregunte a un trabajador electoral

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

- Complete the arrow pointing to your choice, as shown in the picture.
- If you make a mistake, you may request a new ballot.
- To vote for a qualified write-in candidate who is not listed on the ballot, write the person's name on the blank line at the end of the candidate list and complete the arrow.



Party-Nominated Offices.

Only voters who disclosed a preference upon registering to vote for the same party as the candidate seeking the nomination of any party for the Presidency or election to a party committee may vote for that candidate at the primary election, unless the party has adopted a rule to permit non-party voters to vote in its primary elections.

Voter-Nominated and Nonpartisan Offices.

All voters, regardless of the party preference they disclosed upon registration, or refusal to disclose a party preference, may vote for any candidate for a voter-nominated or nonpartisan office. The party preference, if any, designated by a candidate for a voter-nominated office is selected by the candidate and is shown for the information of the voters only. It does not imply that the candidate is nominated or endorsed by the party or that the party approves of the candidate. The party preference, if any, of a candidate for a nonpartisan office does not appear on the ballot.

政黨提名職位。

除非該黨另訂規則允許無黨派選民參加其初選投票，否則只有選民在登記投票時披露的政黨傾向與正尋求其政黨的總統提名或政黨委員會選舉之候選人相同，才可在此初選中為該候選人投票。

選民提名職位和非黨派職位。

所有選民，不論在登記時披露政黨傾向或拒絕表態，均可投票給選民提名職位或是非黨派職位的任何候選人。如果選民提名職位的候選人表明政黨傾向，這是該候選人的個人選擇，而且僅提供作為選民參考。它並非表示候選人受到該政黨認可。選票上的非黨派職位不會列出候選人的政黨傾向（若有）。

正式選票

自由論黨選票
聯合總統初選
三藩市市縣
2016年6月7日

選民指南：

- 將指向您的選擇的箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來，如圖所示。
- 如果填寫錯誤，您可以要求一份新的選票。
- 如果想要投票某個未列在選票上的合格補寫候選人，在候選人名單未提供的空位上填寫此人的姓名並將箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來。

PARTY-NOMINATED OFFICES

政黨提名職位

FEDERAL
聯邦

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
美國總統

Presidential Preference
選民總統候選人

Vote for One / 選一名

38-EC-J16-SB69-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

69

JOHN MCAFEE 約翰·麥克菲	↓
CECIL INCE 塞西爾·因斯	↓
AUSTIN PETERSEN 奧斯汀·彼得森	↓
DARRYL W. PERRY 達瑞爾·W·佩里	↓
DERRICK M. REID 德里克·M·里德	↓
JACK ROBINSON, JR. 傑克·羅賓遜	↓
GARY JOHNSON 加里·約翰遜	↓
MARC FELDMAN 馬克·費爾德曼	↓
RHETT WHITE FEATHER SMITH 瑞特·白羽·史密斯	↓
JOY WAYMIRE 喬伊·威邁爾	↓
STEVE KERBEL 史蒂夫·卡爾貝爾	↓
JOHN HALE 約翰·黑爾	↓
	↓

Vote both sides of ballot
請在選票兩面投票

(2A1)-NC



C1-101-1-LNPPC

CH/N-LIB 1

BT: 19 - E/C - C1

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES 選民提名職位	
FEDERAL / 聯邦	
UNITED STATES SENATOR / 美國參議員 Vote for One / 選一名	
VON HOUOU 馮·胡戈	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 保守
JASON HANANIA 傑森·哈那尼亞	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 律師 / 工程師
KAMALA D. HARRIS 卡瑪拉·D·哈里斯	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 加州司法部長
GAR MYERS 加爾·邁耶斯	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 國際發展促進人
PAUL MERRITT 保羅·梅里特	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 自由職業者
MASSIE MUNROE 瑪西·門羅	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 環境工程師
ELEANOR GARCIA 艾麗諾·加西亞	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 航空工廠工人
TIM GILDERSLEEVE 蒂姆·吉爾德斯利夫	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 移民人交通服務經營者
CLIVE GREY 克萊夫·格雷	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 木匠 / 企業家 / 創業者
DON J. GRUNDMANN 唐·J·格魯德曼	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 脊椎損傷治療師
PRESIDENT CRISTINA GRAPPO 普里西塔·格拉波	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨
HERBERT G. PETERS 赫伯特·G·彼得斯	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨
TOM PALZER 湯姆·帕爾澤	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨
JOHN THOMPSON PARKER 約翰·湯普森·帕克	Party Preference: Peace and Freedom / 和平自由黨 政黨傾向: 和平自由黨 / 鄰居委員會成員
KAREN ROSEBERRY 卡倫·羅斯伯利	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 教育工作者
EMORY RODGERS 艾莫利·羅德格斯	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 物業經理
GEORGE C. YANG 喬治·C·楊	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 互聯網新創公司執行長
JERRY J. LAWS 傑利·J·萊斯	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨
GAIL K. LIGHTFOOT 蓋爾·K·萊特福特	Party Preference: Libertarian / 自由黨 政黨傾向: 自由黨 / 退休註冊護士
MIKE BEITIKS 邁克·貝提克斯	Party Preference: None / 無黨派 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 兼職父親 / 律師

FEDERAL 聯邦	
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 美國眾議員 DISTRICT 14 / 第14選區 Vote for One / 選一名	
JACKIE SPEIER 傑基·斯皮爾	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 聯邦眾議員

STATE 州	
STATE SENATOR 州參議員 DISTRICT 11 / 第11選區 Vote for One / 選一名	
JANE KIM 金景妍	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 三藩市議員
SCOTT WIENER 威爾遜	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 三藩市議員
KEN LOO 盧維強	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 消防員 / 企業主

MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 州眾議員 DISTRICT 19 / 第19選區 Vote for One / 選一名	
PHIL TING 丁立	Party Preference: Democratic / 民主黨 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 州眾議員

38-EC-J16-SB71-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

71

加州眾議員
CARLOS "CHUCK" TAYLOR
 Party Preference: Republican
 Administrator / Minister / Educator
 卡洛斯「查克」泰勒
 政黨傾向：共和黨
 行政助理人 / 牧師 / 教育工作者



Party Preference: Green / Environmental Healing Consultant 政黨傾向：綠黨 / 環境治理顧問	PAMELA ELIZONDO 帕米拉·埃利宗多
Party Preference: None / Social Entrepreneur 政黨傾向：沒有 / 社會公益創業者	SCOTT A. VINEBERG 司格特·A·瓦因伯格
Party Preference: Democratic / Small Business Owner 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 小企業主	STEVE STOKES 史蒂夫·斯托克斯
Party Preference: Republican / Small Businessman / Mediator 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 小企業主 / 調解人	DUF SUNDHEIM 達夫·桑德海姆
Party Preference: None / Author 政黨傾向：沒有 / 作家	LING LING SHI 凌玲·史
Party Preference: Democratic / California Congresswoman 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 聯邦眾議員	LORETTA L. SANCHEZ 羅雷塔·L·桑切斯
Party Preference: Republican / Attorney / Businessman / Rancher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 律師 / 企業家 / 牧場主	PHIL WYMAN 菲爾·魏曼
Party Preference: Republican / Health Care Lawyer 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 醫學律師	JARRELL WILLIAMSON 賈雷爾·威廉森
Party Preference: Republican / Business Attorney / Author 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 商業律師 / 作家	THOMAS G. DEL BECCARO 托馬斯·G·德貝卡羅
Party Preference: Republican / Entrepreneur / Writer / Publisher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 創業者 / 作家 / 出版商	RON UNZ 羅恩·尤恩茲
Party Preference: Republican / Businessman / Attorney / CPA 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 企業家 / 律師 / 註冊會計師	GREG CONLON 格雷格·康隆
Party Preference: None 政黨傾向：沒有	JASON KRAUS 傑森·克羅斯
Party Preference: Republican / Retired 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 退休人士	DON KRAMPE 唐·克拉姆皮
Party Preference: Libertarian / Community Organizer 政黨傾向：自由黨 / 社區組織者	MARK MATTHEW HERD 馬克·馬修·赫德

Vote both sides of ballot
 請在選票兩面投票

C1-2A1-NC

BT: 19 - E/C - C1

正式選票

無黨派選票
聯合總統初選
三藩市市縣
2016年6月7日

Makukuha ang balotang ito sa wikang Filipino
Sa pamamagitan ng koreo: tumawag sa (415) 554-4310
Nang personal magtanong sa manggagawa sa lugar ng botohan

Esta boleta está disponible en español
Por correo: llame al (415) 554-4366
En persona: pregunte a un trabajador electoral

- INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:**
- Complete the arrow pointing to your choice, as shown in the picture, if you make a mistake, you may request a new ballot.
 - To vote for a qualified write-in candidate who is not listed on the ballot, write the person's name on the blank line at the end of the candidate list and complete the arrow.



- 選民指南：**
- 將指向您的選擇的箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來，如圖所示。
 - 如果填寫錯誤，您可以要求一份新的選票。
 - 如果想要投選某個未列在選票上的合格補寫候選人，在候選人名單未提供的空位上填寫此人的姓名並將箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來。

Voter-Nominated and Nonpartisan Offices.

All voters, regardless of the party preference they disclosed upon registration, or refusal to disclose a party preference, may vote for any candidate for a voter-nominated or nonpartisan office. The party preference, if any, designated by a candidate for a voter-nominated office is selected by the candidate and is shown for the information of the voters only. It does not imply that the candidate is nominated or endorsed by the party or that the party approves of the candidate. The party preference, if any, of a candidate for a nonpartisan office does not appear on the ballot.

選民提名職位和非黨派職位。

所有選民，不論在登記時披露政黨傾向或拒絕表態，均可投票給選民提名職位或是非黨派職位的任何候選人。如果選民提名職位的候選人表明政黨傾向，這是該候選人之個人選擇，而且僅提供作為選民參考。它並非表示候選人受到該政黨提名或舉名支持，也不代表候選人受到該政黨認可。選票上的非黨派職位不會列出候選人的政黨傾向（若有）。

This space is intentionally blank.

此部分故意空白。

38-EC-J16-SB73-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

73

PLEASE

Vote both sides of ballot
請在選票兩面投票

BT: 19 - E/C - C1

CH/NPP 1

(2A1)-NC



C1-101-1-NC

VOTER-NOMINATED OFFICES 選民提名職位	
FEDERAL / 聯邦	
UNITED STATES SENATOR / 美國參議員 Vote for One / 選一名	
VON HOUGO 馮·胡戈	Party Preference: Republican / 共和黨 / 教師 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 教師
JASON HANANIA 傑森·哈那尼亞	Party Preference: None / 律師 / 工程師 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 律師 / 工程師
KAMALA D. HARRIS 卡馬拉·D·哈里斯	Party Preference: Democratic / 律師 / 加州司法廳長 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 律師 / 加州司法廳長
GAR MYERS 加里·邁耶斯	Party Preference: None / 國際發展促進人 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 國際發展促進人
PAUL MERRITT 保爾·梅里特	Party Preference: None / Self-Employed 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 自由職業者
MASSIE MUNROE 馬西·門羅	Party Preference: Democratic / Civil Environmental Engineer 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 環境工程師
ELEANOR GARCIA 艾麗諾·加西亞	Party Preference: None / Aerospace Factory Worker 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 航天工廠工人
TIM GILDERSLEEVE 蒂姆·吉爾德斯利夫	Party Preference: None / Paratransit Operator 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 殘障人士交通服務運營者
CLIVE GREY 克萊夫·格雷	Party Preference: None / Woodworker / Businessman / Entrepreneur 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 木匠 / 企業家 / 創業者
DON J. GRUNDMANN 唐·J·格蘭德曼	Party Preference: None / Doctor of Chiropractic 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 脊椎指壓治療師
PRESIDENT CRISTINA GRAPPO 普雷斯利達·克莉絲蒂娜·格拉波	Party Preference: Democratic 政黨傾向: 民主黨
HERBERT G. PETERS 赫伯特·G·彼得斯	Party Preference: Democratic 政黨傾向: 民主黨
TOM PALZER 湯姆·帕爾澤	Party Preference: Republican 政黨傾向: 共和黨
JOHN THOMPSON PARKER 約翰·湯普森·帕克	Party Preference: Peace and Freedom / Neighborhood Council Member 政黨傾向: 和平自由黨 / 鄰里委員會成員
KAREN ROSEBERRY 卡倫·羅斯伯利	Party Preference: Republican / Educator 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 教育工作者
EMORY RODGERS 艾莫利·羅德格斯	Party Preference: Democratic / Property Manager 政黨傾向: 民主黨 / 物業經理
GEORGE C. YANG 喬治·C·楊	Party Preference: Republican / Internet Startup CEO 政黨傾向: 共和黨 / 互聯網新創公司執行長
JERRY J. LAWS 傑利·J·勞斯	Party Preference: Republican 政黨傾向: 共和黨
GAIL K. LIGHTFOOT 蓋爾·K·萊特福特	Party Preference: Libertarian / Retired Registered Nurse 政黨傾向: 自由黨 / 退休註冊護士
MIKE BETTIS 邁克·貝蒂斯	Party Preference: None / Stay-at-home Dad / Attorney 政黨傾向: 沒有 / 家庭父職 / 律師

FEDERAL 聯邦	
UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 美國眾議員 DISTRICT 14 / 第14選區 Vote for One / 選一名	
JACKIE SPEIER 傑姬·斯皮爾	Party Preference: Democratic Congresswoman 政黨傾向: 民主黨 聯邦眾議員
STATE 州	
STATE SENATOR 州參議員 DISTRICT 11 / 第11選區 Vote for One / 選一名	
JANE KIM 金咸新	Party Preference: Democratic San Francisco Supervisor 政黨傾向: 民主黨 三藩市議員
SCOTT WIENER 威善爾	Party Preference: Democratic Member, Board of Supervisors 政黨傾向: 民主黨 市議員
KEN LOO 盧健強	Party Preference: Republican Firefighter / Business Owner 政黨傾向: 共和黨 消防員 / 企業主
MEMBER OF THE STATE ASSEMBLY 州眾議員 DISTRICT 19 / 第19選區 Vote for One / 選一名	
PHIL TING 丁石立	Party Preference: Democratic Assemblymember 政黨傾向: 民主黨

38-EC-J16-SB75-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

75

加州眾議員
CARLOS "CHUCK" TAYLOR
 Party Preference: Republican
 Administrator / Minister / Educator
 卡洛斯「查克」泰勒
 政黨傾向：共和黨
 行政督理人 / 教師 / 教育工作者

Party Preference: Green / Environmental Healing Consultant 政黨傾向：綠黨 / 環境治理顧問	PAMELA ELIZONDO 帕米拉·埃利桑多
Party Preference: None / Social Entrepreneur 政黨傾向：沒有 / 社會公益創業者	SCOTT A. VINEBERG 司格特·A·瓦因伯格
Party Preference: Democratic / Small Business Owner 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 小企業主	STEVE STOKES 史蒂夫·斯托克斯
Party Preference: Republican / Small Businessman / Mediator 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 小企業主 / 調解人	DUF SUNDHEIM 達夫·桑德海姆
Party Preference: None / Author 政黨傾向：沒有 / 作家	LING LING SHI 史玲玲
Party Preference: Democratic / California Congresswoman 政黨傾向：民主黨 / 聯邦眾議員	LORETTA L. SANCHEZ 羅雷塔·L·桑切斯
Party Preference: Republican / Attorney / Businessman / Rancher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 律師 / 企業家 / 牧場主	PHIL WYMAN 菲爾·魏曼
Party Preference: Republican / Health Care Lawyer 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 醫學律師	JARRELL WILLIAMSON 賈雷爾·威廉森
Party Preference: Republican / Business Attorney / Author 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 商業律師 / 作家	THOMAS G. DEL BECCARO 托馬斯·G·德貝卡羅
Party Preference: Republican / Entrepreneur / Writer / Publisher 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 創業者 / 作家 / 出版商	RON UNZ 羅恩·尤恩茲
Party Preference: Republican / Businessman / Attorney / CPA 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 企業家 / 律師 / 註冊會計師	GREG CONLON 格雷格·康隆
Party Preference: None 政黨傾向：沒有	JASON KRAUS 傑森·克羅斯
Party Preference: Republican / Retired 政黨傾向：共和黨 / 退休人士	DON KRAMPE 唐·克拉姆皮
Party Preference: Libertarian / Community Organizer 政黨傾向：自由黨 / 社區組織者	MARK MATTHEW HERD 馬克·馬修·赫德

Vote both sides of ballot
 請在選票兩面投票

C1-2A1-NC

BT: 19 - E/C - C1

76

Your Sample Ballot

38-EC-J16-SB76-BT19

OFFICIAL BALLOT

Consolidated Presidential Primary Election
City and County of San Francisco
June 7, 2016

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

- Complete the arrow pointing to your choice, as shown in the picture.
- If you make a mistake, you may request a new ballot.
- To vote for a qualified write-in candidate who is not listed on the ballot, write the person's name on the blank line at the end of the candidate list and complete the arrow.

Makukuha ang balotang ito sa wikang Filipino
Sa pamamagitan ng koreo: tumawag sa (415) 554-4310

Nang personal magtanong sa manggagawa sa lugar ng botohan

Esta boleta está disponible en español
Por correo: llame al (415) 554-4366

En persona: pregunte a un trabajador electoral

**正式選票**

聯合總統初選
三藩市市縣
2016年6月7日

選民指南：

- 將指向您的選擇的箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來，如圖所示。
- 如果填寫錯誤，您可以要求一份新的選票。
- 如果想要投選某個未列在選票上的合格補寫候選人，在候選人名單未提供的空位上填寫此人的姓名並將箭頭和箭尾劃線連接起來。

NONPARTISAN OFFICES 無黨派職位
JUDICIAL 司法
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, OFFICE NO. 7 高等法院法官，第7席 Vote for One / 選一名
PAUL HENDERSON Prosecutor / Public Servant 檢察官 / 公職人員
VICTOR HWANG Civil Rights Attorney 黃正凱 民權律師
SIGRID ELIZABETH IRIAS Civil Litigation Attorney 西格麗德·伊雅思 民事訴訟律師

38-EC-J16-SB77-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

77

PLEASE

Vote both sides of ballot
請在選票兩面投票

BT: 19 - E/C - C2

(4A1)-C



C2-223-3-C

2

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS 提交選民投票的提案

STATE PROPOSITIONS 州提案

50 **SUSPENSION OF LEGISLATORS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.** Authorizes Legislature to suspend Members, including without salary and benefits. Prohibits suspended Members from using powers of office or legislative resources. Provides suspension may end on specified date or by vote of Member's house. Fiscal Impact: No effect on state spending in most years. Minor state savings in some years.

暫停立法機關成員職務。立法性憲法修正案。授權議會暫停議員職務，包括停薪和停發福利。禁止暫停職務的議員使用職權或議會資源。規定可在指定日期或由議員所屬的議院投票終止暫停職務。財政影響：在多數年份對州支出並無影響。州政府在一些年份可節省少許資金。

YES / 贊成

NO / 反對

CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS 市縣提案

A **SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BOND, 2016.** To protect public health and safety, improve community medical and mental health care services, earthquake safety, and emergency medical response; to seismically improve, and modernize neighborhood fire stations and vital public health and homeless service sites; to construct a seismically safe and improved San Francisco Fire Department ambulance deployment facility; and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$350,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to citizen oversight and regular audits?

2016年三藩市公共衛生和安全公債。為了維護公共衛生與安全，改進社區醫療與精神保健服務、地震安全和緊急醫療救護應急能力；為了改善社區鄰里消防站、重要公共健康和無家可歸者服務場所的防震性能，並對它們進行現代化改良；為了改良三藩市消防局救護車調配設施的防震安全性；以及為了支付相關費用，三藩市是否應在獨立的市民監督與定期審計約束下，發行3.5億美元的普通義務公債？

YES / 贊成

NO / 反對

B Shall the City amend the Charter to extend the Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund until 2046 and give the Recreation and Park Department each year a minimum baseline amount from the General Fund in addition to the Fund set-aside of 2 1/2 cents for each \$100 of assessed property value?

市府是否應修改市憲章，將公園、娛樂和開放空間基金延長至2046年，除了在每100元物業估值中撥款2.5分到該基金外，並每年從普通基金中撥款最低基準額度給予娛樂和公園局？

YES / 贊成

NO / 反對

C Shall the City amend the Charter to increase affordable housing requirements for private developers of new market-rate housing projects of 25 or more units until the Board of Supervisors passes an ordinance changing those requirements and also authorize the Board of Supervisors to change affordable housing requirements by ordinance?

市府是否應修改市憲章，針對興建25個或以上市價房屋單位項目的私人開發商提高市價新屋項目的可負擔房屋要求，有效期至至市會議通過法令變更這些要求；此提案同時授權市參議會通過更改法令的方式來變更可負擔房屋要求？

YES / 贊成

NO / 反對

D Shall the Office of Citizen Complaints investigate any incident occurring within the City in which a San Francisco police officer fires a gun killing or physically injuring someone?

YES / 贊成

38-EC-J16-SB79-BT19

Your Sample Ballot

79

市民投訴辦公室是否應調查每一件在本市發生的三灣市警員槍殺或傷害市民事件？

E

Shall the City amend the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to parallel broader state law provisions without reducing the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance's coverage and allow employees to use paid sick leave hours for the broader purposes authorized by state law?

市府是否應修改帶薪病假法令，使其與涵蓋更廣泛的州法法令並行，同時在不縮減帶薪病假法令規定的福利下，允許員工將帶薪病假時數用於州法核准的更廣泛用途？

NO / 反對

YES / 贊成

NO / 反對

DISTRICT PROPOSITIONS 選區提案

San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Program: To protect San Francisco Bay for future generations by reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protecting communities from floods, and increasing shoreline public access, shall the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority authorize a parcel tax of \$12 per year, raising approximately \$25 million annually for twenty years with independent citizen oversight, audits, and all funds staying local?

AA

San Francisco Bay 潔淨水質、污染防治及棲息地修復計劃。透過減少垃圾、污染及有毒物質，提升水質，復育魚類、鳥類和野生動物的棲息地；保護社區免受洪患及增設海岸線的公共通道以保護 San Francisco Bay 未來世代，在接受獨立市民監督、審計且所有資金均留在當地的前提下，San Francisco Bay 修復管理局是否應授權一項 12 美元的年度土地稅，每年籌集約 25,000,000 美元資金，為期二十年？

YES / 贊成

NO / 反對

Vote both sides of ballot
請在選票兩面投票



C2-4A1-C

BT: 19 - E/C - C2



Local Ballot Measure and Argument Information

Digest and Argument Pages, Legal Text

This pamphlet includes the following information for each local ballot measure:

- An impartial summary, or digest, prepared by the Ballot Simplification Committee
- A statement by the City Controller about the fiscal impact or cost of each measure
- A statement of how the measure qualified to be on the ballot
- Arguments in favor of and against each measure
- The legal text for all local ballot measures begins on page 120.

Proponent's and Opponent's Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (proponent's argument) and one argument against the measure (opponent's argument) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designations "proponent's argument" and "opponent's argument" indicate only that the arguments were selected according to the criteria below (*San Francisco Municipal Elections Code, Section 545*) and printed free of charge.

Selection of Proponent's and Opponent's Arguments

The proponent's argument and the opponent's argument are selected according to the following priorities:

Proponent's Argument	Opponent's Argument
① The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four or more members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.	① In the case of a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
② The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.	② The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
③ The Mayor.	③ The Mayor.
④ Any association of citizens, combination of voters and association of citizens, or any individual voter.	④ Any association of citizens, combination of voters and association of citizens, or any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a proponent's argument or an opponent's argument may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument, or response, to be printed free of charge. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding proponent's argument and opponent's argument.



All arguments are strictly the opinions of their authors. Arguments are printed as submitted, including any typographical, spelling, or grammatical errors. They are not checked for accuracy by the Director of Elections nor any other City agency, official, or employee.

Paid Arguments

In addition to the proponents' arguments, opponents' arguments, and rebuttals, which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed on the pages following the proponent's and opponent's arguments and rebuttals. All of the paid arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the paid arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are printed in order of submission.

Words You Need to Know

by the Ballot Simplification Committee

10-year Capital Plan (Proposition A): The San Francisco Administrative Code requires the City to prepare and adopt a 10-year plan to meet the City's capital infrastructure needs. The plan includes a timeline for issuing new bonds.

Accrue (Proposition E): Earn; accumulate.

Affordable housing (Proposition C): Residential units that households within a certain range of incomes would be able to afford.

Appropriate (Proposition B): To set aside for a specific use.

Area Median Income (AMI) (Proposition C): A level of income based on all incomes earned within San Francisco. Half of all households have incomes above this level and half have incomes below it. The attached chart shows the AMI for certain households in San Francisco.

Income Definition	1 person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person
20% OF MEDIAN	\$14,250	\$16,300	\$18,350	\$20,400
55% OF MEDIAN	\$39,250	\$44,850	\$50,450	\$56,050
60% OF MEDIAN	\$42,800	\$48,900	\$55,000	\$61,150
80% OF MEDIAN	\$57,100	\$65,200	\$73,350	\$81,500
100% OF MEDIAN	\$71,350	\$81,500	\$91,700	\$101,900
120% OF MEDIAN	\$85,600	\$97,800	\$110,050	\$122,300
140% OF MEDIAN	\$99,900	\$114,100	\$128,400	\$142,650
150% OF MEDIAN	\$107,050	\$122,250	\$137,550	\$152,850

Assessed property value (Proposition B): The value of real property as determined every year by the City's Office of the Assessor.

Capital project (Proposition A): A project initiated by one-time funding to improve the City's infrastructure.

Charter amendment (Propositions B, C): A change to the City's Charter. The Charter is the City's Constitution. The Charter can only be changed by a majority of the votes cast.

Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (Proposition A): A nine-member body that monitors the City's use of funds generated by issuing general obligation bonds. Members of this committee are appointed by the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the Controller and the Civil Grand Jury.

General Fund (Proposition B): That part of the City's annual budget that can be used for any City purpose. Each year, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors decide how the General Fund will be used. Money for the General Fund comes from property, business, sales, and other taxes and fees.

General obligation bond (Proposition A): A promise issued by the City to pay back money borrowed, plus interest, by a certain date. The City repays the money, plus interest, with property taxes over a period of years. General obligation bond measures must be approved by the voters.

Interest (Proposition A): The cost of borrowing money.

Low- and middle-income (Proposition C): See AMI chart on page 99.

Office of Citizen Complaints (Proposition D): The City department that investigates complaints against San Francisco police officers and makes policy recommendations regarding police practices.

Ordinance (Propositions A, C, D, E): A local law passed by the Board of Supervisors or by the voters.

Pass through (Proposition A): To recover an increase in property taxes by passing on a portion of the cost to tenants.

Principal (Proposition A): The amount of borrowed money. Principal does not include interest charges.

Property tax (Propositions A, B): A tax assessed by the City on buildings and land.

Qualified write-in candidate: A person who has completed the required paperwork and signatures for inclusion as a write-in candidate. Although the name of this person will not appear on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person in the space on the ballot provided for write-in votes and following specific ballot instructions. The Department of Elections counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

Revenue (Propositions A, B): Income.

Set-aside (Proposition B): Designates a specific amount of funding from property taxes or other general City revenues for a particular purpose. This removes the discretion of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors regarding how the City will use the funds.

Site (Propositions A, C): A specific location.

Trauma center (Proposition A): A hospital equipped to provide comprehensive emergency medical services.

A**Public Health and Safety Bond**

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BOND, 2016. To protect public health and safety, improve community medical and mental health care services, earthquake safety, and emergency medical response; to seismically improve, and modernize neighborhood fire stations and vital public health and homeless service sites; to construct a seismically safe and improved San Francisco Fire Department ambulance deployment facility; and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$350,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to citizen oversight and regular audits?

YES  
 NO  

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The San Francisco Department of Public Health (Department) has operated San Francisco General Hospital on Potrero Avenue for 100 years. The campus was renamed the Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center in 2015.

As the City's public hospital and trauma center, it treats more than 100,000 patients a year. Some of the buildings on this campus do not meet seismic safety standards for hospitals and are not expected to remain functional in the event of a major earthquake.

The Department's 10 high-demand neighborhood health clinics are outdated and unable to meet current needs for families seeking medical and mental health care, urgent care, substance abuse, dental care and social services.

Many City neighborhood fire stations are in need of repair and modernization. The facility that houses City-owned ambulances does not meet seismic standards and is inadequate to ensure the most timely emergency response.

City-owned homeless shelters and service sites are inadequate and need repair.

To pay for capital projects such as these, the City borrows money by selling general obligation bonds in accordance with its 10-year Capital Plan. The City uses property tax revenues to pay the principal and interest on those bonds. The spending of bond revenue is overseen by the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.

The Proposal: Proposition A is an ordinance that would allow the City to borrow up to \$350 million by issuing general obligation bonds. The City would use this money to build, acquire, and improve facilities for health care, emergency response and safety, and homeless services. The use of the funds would be as follows:

- \$272 million to fund seismic improvements and upgrades to fire safety systems at the City's public hospital and trauma center; and renovate and expand the Southeast Health Center and other high-demand neighborhood health clinics to improve and expand access to mental health, urgent care, substance abuse, dental care, and social services;
- \$58 million to build a higher-capacity, more efficient and seismically safer facility for City-owned ambulances to improve emergency medical response, and to repair and modernize neighborhood fire stations; and
- \$20 million to build, acquire, and improve facilities to better serve homeless individuals and families at homeless shelters and homeless service sites.

Proposition A would allow an increase in the property tax to pay for the bonds, if needed. However it is City policy to limit the amount of money it borrows by issuing new bonds only as prior bonds are paid off. Landlords would be permitted to pass through up to 50% of any resulting property tax increase to tenants.

Proposition A also would require the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee to review the spending of bond funds. One-tenth of one percent

This measure requires 66⅔% affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 120. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

(0.1%) of the bond funds would pay for the committee's audit and oversight functions.

Approval of this measure requires two-thirds of votes cast.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want the City to issue \$350 million in general obligation bonds to:

- fund seismic improvements and upgraded fire safety systems at the City's public hospital and trauma center;
- renovate and expand the Southeast Health Center and other high-demand neighborhood health clinics operated by the City's Department of Public Health;
- construct a higher-capacity, more efficient and seismically safer San Francisco Fire Department Ambulance Facility;
- repair and modernize neighborhood fire stations; and
- build, acquire, and improve facilities to better serve homeless individuals and families at homeless shelters and homeless service sites.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want the City to issue these bonds.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed \$350 million in bonds be authorized and sold under current assumptions, the approximate costs will be as follows:

- In fiscal year 2016–2017, following issuance of the first series of bonds, and the year with the lowest tax rate, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$10.4 million and result in a property tax rate of \$0.0051 per \$100 (\$5.07 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- In fiscal year 2021–2022, following issuance of the last series of bonds, the estimated annual costs of debt service would be \$30.7 million and result in a property tax rate of \$0.0121 per \$100 (\$12.00 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.
- The best estimate of the average tax rate for these bonds from fiscal year 2016–2017 through 2037–2038 is \$0.0092 per \$100 (\$9.04 per \$100,000) of assessed valuation.

- Based on these estimates, the highest estimated annual property tax cost for these bonds for the owner of a home with an assessed value of \$600,000 would be approximately \$77.03.

These estimates are based on projections only, which are not binding upon the City. Projections and estimates may vary due to the timing of bond sales, the amount of bonds sold at each sale, and actual assessed valuation over the term of repayment of the bonds. Hence, the actual tax rate and the years in which such rates are applicable may vary from those estimated above. The City's current debt management policy is to issue new general obligation bonds only as old ones are retired, keeping the property tax impact from general obligation bonds approximately the same over time.

How "A" Got on the Ballot

On February 23, 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted 10 to 1 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener, Yee.

No: Peskin.

This measure requires 66⅔% affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 120. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

Earthquake Safe Healthcare and Emergency Response—Yes on A

San Francisco General Hospital is our city's only Level One acute care hospital and trauma center—and the heart of a public health and emergency response network on which all San Franciscans rely and will depend after an earthquake or other disaster. We started the work of making essential upgrades and improvements with construction of a new acute care and trauma center hospital building at SFGH. Now we need to continue shoring up and improving other key structures on the SFGH campus and at community health clinics, neighborhood fire stations and ambulance deployment facilities, and homeless shelter and care sites.

Support Proposition A to:

Protect and improve space for much-needed **mental health and emergency psychiatric services** provided in older structures on the SFGH campus.

Ensure SFGH medical staff safety so the hospital can continue its role as the city's only Level One trauma center capable of treating **life-threatening illness and injury**.

Bolster facilities for **mental-health and drug-treatment services for the homeless** to get more people off the street and into the care they need.

Improve **emergency rescue and response** performance by relocating our city's ambulance deployment center and upgrading neighborhood fire stations.

Reinforce and modernize the SFGH campus and community clinics that **advance medical research** and provide **urgent and outpatient care**.

A YES vote on A authorizes these investments in vital services—with **regular audits** of spending, monitoring by a Citizen's General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, and **without tax increases**.

Mayor Ed Lee

London Breed, President, SF Board of Supervisors

*Roland Pickens, Director, SF Health Network**

*Joanne Hayes-White, Chief, SF Fire Department**

*Edward A. Chow, M.D., President, SF Health Commission**

*David B. Singer, M.D., Vice President, SF Health Commission**

*James W. Dilley, M.D., Chief of Psychiatry, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition A

The argument in favor of Proposition A merely restates with feeling the list of proposed projects on which \$350 million will be spent if the bond is approved. It does not discuss need or cost, or suggest that the use of any building will change.

Nor does it discuss why the bond is needed now, or its relation to two similar recent bond measures, the \$400 million Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond passed in June 2014 or the \$412 million Earthquake Safety Bond passed in November 2010.

It would be cheaper, simpler and more honest if the city set up an improvement fund from which annual disbursements for necessary maintenance and upgrades could be made. City politicians should abandon their preference for aggregating all capital improvements into bond measures creating unnecessary future debt. In addition to the interest, fees, and administrative costs they involve, bonds encourage inflated costs and cost overruns.

Vote NO on A.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

An interesting thing happened to Proposition A on the way to the ballot. A sizeable allocation to build a new animal shelter for the City's ever-dwindling stray pet population morphed into one for new homeless shelters.

Perhaps only a heartless skinflint would vote against "elf and safety". Who could be against "seismic retrofits," "emergency response" or "urgent care"? Yet the breadth and vagueness of the projects, and the ease with which one can be substituted for another, make one wonder.

Its proponents claim that the bond would not increase local property taxes. Just not let them fall! The City would issue new bonds to replace old ones being retired, so that taxes stay high. A general obligation bond measure is in fact no different from a tax -- a deferred one that gets paid by taxpayers after the money is spent, together with additional costs and interest. A better approach would be to include any necessary renovations in ordinary city planning and budgeting, and to start making an effort to reduce property taxes.

So are these projects cost-justified? The answer is a resounding NO. Mark Zuckerberg donated \$75 million for the new San Francisco General Hospital, and the bond proceeds will just spruce up surrounding buildings. The Fire Department's plan to construct a facility to park and dispatch ambulances can easily adapt an existing warehouse-sized structure. The smaller neighborhood sites for fire, health and homeless services do not require major construction and can be spread out over time.

The City's \$9 billion budget for the next fiscal year is \$10,500 per resident. This makes San Francisco the country's third highest spending city, behind only New York (a special case) and Washington D.C. (a city founded on big government).

Cut wasteful spending! Vote NO on A.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco
www.lpsf.org

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition A

Essential Health and Emergency Upgrades without Tax Increases—Yes on A

Proposition A will allow San Francisco to continue the job we began in 2008 of funding essential reinforcement and improvement of vital public health and emergency response facilities—without tax increases. Now, as a city, we turn our attention to other buildings at SFGH, including seismically deficient structures housing our only secure 24/7 **emergency psychiatric ward**, cutting-edge **medical research that improves lives**, and **urgent care and outpatient services** on which all San Franciscans can rely.

Proposition A also will:

Enhance emergency response capability by relocating and rebuilding our city's lone ambulance deployment facility and making upgrades at neighborhood fire stations.

Shore up and modernize community health clinics that are essential to a healthy and resilient city and extend public health services into the neighborhoods.

Strengthen and expand mental health, substance abuse and shelter facilities for the homeless to get more people off the street and into the care they need.

And, as was the case with construction of the new acute care and trauma center hospital at SFGH, **all expenditures will receive regular audits and monitoring by a Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.**

For more information, visit www.YesOnSFHealth.org.

Mayor Ed Lee

London Breed, President, SF Board of Supervisors

*Roland Pickens, Director, SF Health Network**

*Joanne Hayes-White, Chief, SF Fire Department**

*Edward A. Chow, M.D., President, SF Health Commission**

*David B. Singer, Vice President, SF Health Commission**

*James W. Dilley, M.D., Chief of Psychiatry, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**Local Democrats Support Public Health and Safety!**

Proposition A will fund essential safety improvements to SF General Hospital and the Fire Departments Ambulance Facility. Proposition A will also fund more critical homeless facilities. Please join a coalition of local Democrats and vote YES on Prop A!

*Francis Tsang; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Joel Engardio; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Tom Hsieh; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Marjan Philhour; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Leah Pimentel; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Arlo Hale Smith; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Josh Arce; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Kat Anderson; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Mary Jung; Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Gary McCoy; Long-time San Francisco Democrat**

*Keith Baraka; Long-time San Francisco Democrat**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Tom Hsieh For DCCC.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**Mayors of San Francisco Say YES on A!**

As mayors, we took an oath to protect the health and welfare of our residents. We could never have accomplished that without San Francisco General Hospital, our community health clinics, our firefighters, and emergency response.

Proposition A strengthens each of these essential facets in a smart and responsible way, so that San Francisco can continue to thrive. Through investments in earthquake safe facilities and more efficient emergency response, Proposition A will keep our city healthy and safe.

Join Mayor Ed Lee, and former mayors Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, Willie L. Brown Jr., Art Agnos and Senator Dianne Feinstein in supporting YES on A.

Mayor Ed Lee

Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, Former Mayor Willie L. Brown Jr., Former Mayor Art Agnos, Former Mayor Senator Dianne Feinstein, Former Mayor

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**General Hospital Leaders Urge San Francisco to Vote YES on A!**

San Francisco General Hospital is one of the best public hospitals in the country and is the core of our City's commitment to provide high-quality health care. General Hospital cares for more than 1,500 patients every day, over 100,000 unique patients a year, and houses the only Level One trauma center and 24/7 emergency psychiatric service in San Francisco.

Proposition A will allow General Hospital to continue its commitment to our City's health by reinforcing and modernizing its campus. Proposition A will make essential earthquake safety improvements at General Hospital's Building 5, so that it can house a centralized outpatient center and urgent care, and preserve psychiatric services.

Make General Hospital safer and more efficient. Vote YES on A!

*Roland Pickens, Director, SF Health Network**

*James W. Dilley, M.D., Chief of Psychiatry, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Mark Leary, M.D., Deputy Chief, Psychiatry, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Jeff Critchfield, M.D., Chief Medical Experience Officer, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Amanda Sue Carlisle, PhD, M.D., Vice Dean, UCSF, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Benjamin N. Breyer, M.D. Chief of Urology, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Elena Fuentes-Afflick, M.D. Chief of Pediatrics, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Eleanor Drey, M.D., EdM, Medical Director Women's Option Center, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*Teresa Villela, Physician, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**Mental Health Leaders Call on Voters to Vote YES on A!**

San Francisco General Hospital houses the city's only 24/7 emergency psychiatric service. Proposition A will preserve the service and improve much-needed mental health care at General Hospital and in community clinics. By passing Proposition A, we have an opportunity to preserve mental health and substance abuse services available to our most vulnerable citizens.

Vote YES on Proposition A!

*James W. Dilley, M.D., Chief of Psychiatry, Zuckerberg SF General Hospital**

Progress Foundation

*Mark Farrell, District 2 Supervisor; Member, Mental Health Board of SF**

*Benny Wong, Licensed Clinical Social Worker; Member, Mental Health Board of SF**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**Taxpayer Advocates Agree that Proposition A is Necessary for San Francisco**

Proposition A will ensure that San Francisco's public hospital, health network, and emergency response system will better serve the city's population – **with no additional taxes**. Since new bonds cannot be taken out until old bonds are retired, the rate of taxing will remain constant if Proposition A is passed.

Join taxpayer advocates in voting YES on Proposition A!

Carmen Chu, Assessor-Recorder

Phil Ting, California Assemblymember

*Fiona Ma, Chairwoman, State Board of Equalization**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on SF Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**Homeless Advocates Urge San Francisco Voters to Say YES on A**

Over 6,500 people experience homelessness in San Francisco every night. It's more important than ever to invest in infrastructure that gets those in need off the street and into the care they need. Proposition A invests \$20 million in structural improvements to homeless shelters to make them more accessible to the city's most vulnerable.

Proposition A funds critical capital improvements to shelters serving homeless families and individuals, while meeting Americans with Disability Act (ADA) standards to make shelters more accessible for those with disability. Proposition A creates a centralized deployment and service facility for the San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team to improve street outreach coordination and service delivery.

YES on A ensures that the most vulnerable San Franciscans are able to get the help they need.

Join us in supporting Proposition A!

*Kara Zordel, Executive Director, Project Homeless Connect**

Community Housing Partnership

*Cecil Williams, Co-Founder, GLIDE**

*Janice Mirikitani, Co-Founder GLIDE**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A**Join Firefighters in Voting YES on A!**

When it comes to saving lives, seconds matter. Proposition A will make responding to an emergency easier by dramatically reducing ambulance restocking times. Four new indoor restocking bays will enable faster turnaround times, which will mean more ambulances on the street available for dispatch. The new facility will also be a seismically safe, which means it will be fully functional after a major earthquake. This will improve conditions in which paramedics, firefighters, and healthcare providers work.

The current ambulance deployment facility in San Francisco was never meant to be a permanent home for first responders. It's a shared facility that is over

crowded and inefficient for the current workload. Proposition A will create a new ambulance deployment facility that is closer to main freeways, allows for more efficient restock, and keeps paramedics safe so they can effectively respond in the event of a large-scale emergency.

Proposition A will also make necessary upgrades to fire stations around San Francisco so that our firefighters are safe and able to respond quickly to emergency.

Protect our emergency responders and their ability to quickly respond to an emergency. Vote YES on A!

*Joanne Hayes-White, Chief, San Francisco Fire Department**

*Mark Gonzales, Deputy Chief, San Francisco Fire Department**

*Anthony Rivera, Captain, San Francisco Fire Department**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Working Families Support Yes on A

Working families depend on San Francisco General Hospital, healthcare clinics and emergency services. Proposition A will guarantee that General Hospital remains our city's Level One acute care hospital and trauma center. A YES vote on Proposition A will preserve mental health and substance abuse services available to those who need it most.

Proposition A will help rebuild neighborhood health clinics and fire stations, homeless shelter and care facilities, and replace our city's lone ambulance deployment center.

Everyday, thousands of nurses, doctors, and medical assistants provide an invaluable service to our community by advancing the public's health and safety. YES on Proposition A protects their workplace safety and, in doing so, safeguards patient safety.

To help protect and promote the health and safety of working families, please vote YES on A.

*San Francisco Labor Council
Tim Paulson, Executive Director*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

The San Francisco Democratic Party Urges a YES vote on Proposition A

Proposition A is necessary to maintain San Francisco's health and emergency services. A YES vote on A will improve and expand access to health services and bolster earthquake safety at General Hospital, the city's only trauma center and 24/7 emergency psychiatric service. It's a matter of when, not if, a large earthquake hits San Francisco, and Prop A will ensure that the city responds to and recovers from a natural disaster with more efficient ambulance and rescue services, and more modern, earthquake safe hospitals and community health centers.

Voting YES on A will also help those in need by preserving mental health and substance abuse services available for the homeless and help people get off the street and into the care they need.

Join the San Francisco Democratic Party and vote YES on A!

*San Francisco Democratic Party
Mark Leno, California State Senator
David Chiu, California Assemblymember
Phil Ting, California Assemblymember
Fiona Ma, Chairwoman, California Board of Equalization.*
Mary Jung, Chair, DCCC
Zoe Dunning, First Vice Chair, DCCC
Alix Rosenthal, Second Vice Chair, DCCC
Trevor McNeil, Third Vice Chair, DCCC
Leah Pimentel, Fourth Vice Chair, DCCC
Kat Anderson, Recording Secretary DCCC
Tom A. Hsieh, Treasurer, DCCC*

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

PROP A SUPPORTS CLINICS, SHELTER AND FIRE STATIONS

San Francisco badly needs to modernize and earthquake-proof medical facilities, neighborhood clinics and fire stations. We also need additional homeless shelters.

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Proposition A pays for these important facilities without raising the property tax rate.

Join business, labor and civic organizations to improve health, fire and shelter facilities by voting YES on A.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and our 2,500 local businesses.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Women Leaders Support Proposition A to Strengthen SF Health and Emergency Response

Women and children make up a majority of the over 100,000 unique patients that visit San Francisco General Hospital every year. With the range of health needs that confront us, from childbirth to illness, San Francisco women are coming together to protect the future health of our city by voting YES on A to safeguard General Hospital outpatient services from an earthquake.

General Hospital has always been at the forefront of women's health and research, and a YES vote on A will maintain those valued and needed services.

Proposition A will bolster San Francisco's emergency response by improving fire and rescue services, while at the same time strengthening community health by repairing clinics across the city.

Vote YES on A, an essential step to keep women and San Francisco safe and healthy.

*Fiona Ma, Chairwoman, State Board of Equalization**
London Breed, President, Board of Supervisors

Katy Tang, District 4 Supervisor

Jane Kim, District 6 Supervisor

Malia Cohen, District 10 Supervisor

Dr. Emily Murase, Commissioner, Board of Education;
*Executive Director, San Francisco Department on the Status of Women**

*Jill Wynns, Commissioner, Board of Education**

*Hydra Mendoza, Commissioner, Board of Education**

*Rachel Norton, Commissioner, Board of Education**

*Thea Selby, Vice President, City College of San Francisco**

*Dr. Amy Bacharach, Trustee, City College of San Francisco**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

It Takes All Hospitals to Keep San Francisco Healthy

Hospitals throughout San Francisco support Proposition A to strengthen San Francisco General Hospital and community health clinics.

Quality access to health care in San Francisco is dependent on all of our hospitals and neighborhood health centers continuing to serve our citizens. General Hospital and community health clinics play a pivotal role in the health of San Francisco, and Proposition A makes their services more resilient. Proposition A will help San Francisco recover quickly after an emergency or natural disaster with more efficient ambulance and rescue services and earthquake safe hospitals and community health centers.

Please Join us in voting YES on Prop A!

Hospital Council

Representing all the hospitals, public and private, in San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

The LGBT Community Urges a YES Vote on Proposition A

San Francisco General Hospital has stood strong with the LGBT community since opening the doors of Ward 86 and becoming a leader in HIV/AIDS care and research. Today, it is time we stand with General Hospital and vote YES on A so that the hospital's essential services can be preserved by a strong health and safety network.

Many of San Francisco's homeless are LGBT and deserve access to safe and accessible service sites and shelters. Proposition A provides needed structural upgrades to homeless service sites and improvements to mental health care.

We're voting YES on A to support LGBT health and safety in San Francisco!

Tom Ammiano, Former California State Assemblymember

Mark Leno, California State Senator

Scott Wiener, District 8 Supervisor

David Campos, District 9 Supervisor

Catherine J. Dodd, R.N., Health Administrator

Mary Foley, R.N.

Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Peter Gallotta, President Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Laura Thomas, Former President, Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club

Tom Temprano, Former President, Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club

*Zoe Dunning, Former Chair, Alice B. Toklas LGBT Democratic Club**

Rebecca Prozan, Member, DCCC

*Rafael Mandelman, President, City College Board**

*Alex Randolph, City College Trustee**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Community Leaders Say Expand Access to Our City's Health Services – Vote YES on A!

Communities across San Francisco rely on neighborhood clinics to stay healthy and to thrive. With no new taxes, Proposition A provides an enduring investment in our city's growing health care needs while ensuring that General Hospital continues to play a pivotal role in providing services to our city's most vulnerable populations.

Proposition A authorizes earthquake reinforcement and other safety improvements to General Hospital and community clinics. It invests in a new ambulance deployment center and fire station improvements so that first responders can reach our neighborhoods with more efficiency.

Voting YES on A is about investing in our communities and our future.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A!

*Reverend Cecil Williams, Co-Founder GLIDE**

*Fiona Ma, Chairwoman, State Board of Equalization**

London Breed, President, Board of Supervisors

Eric Mar, District 1 Supervisor

Mark Farrell, District 2 Supervisor

Katy Tang, District 4 Supervisor

Jane Kim, District 6 Supervisor

Norman Yee, District 7 Supervisor

Scott Wiener, District 8 Supervisor

David Campos, District 9 Supervisor

Malia Cohen, District 10 Supervisor

John Avalos, District 11 Supervisor

*Dr. Amos C. Brown, President, San Francisco NAACP**

*Reverend Arnold G. Townsend, Vice President, San Francisco NAACP**

*Dr. Annette Shelton, Second Vice President, San Francisco, NAACP**

*Shamann Walton, Vice President, San Francisco Board of Education**

*Dr. Emily Murase, Member, Board of Education**

*Diane Le, President, San Francisco Young Democrats**

*Jess Montejano, Co-President, Latinos Unidos**

Wendolyn Aragon, Richmond District Community Leader

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition A

Supervisor Aaron Peskin urges you to vote Yes on Prop. A

When the decision about whether to place Prop. A on the ballot came before the Board of Supervisors, I voted against it.

I felt decisions about which projects were included in the measure and which were left out were driven by politics instead of by the city's established capital planning process.

But while I may not like the process by which Prop. A was developed, the measure itself as originally written is vital to protect public health and safety in San Francisco.

Prop. A will complete the earthquake safety retrofit of research facilities at San Francisco General Hospital necessary to maintain the hospital's designation as the region's only Level 1 Trauma Center.

Prop. A also will create a new centralized, earthquake-safe ambulance depot, upgrade neighborhood fire stations and expand community health clinics.

I am going to vote Yes on Prop. A to make our most important public health facilities more earthquake safe.

Supervisor Aaron Peskin

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on Public Health and Safety Bond 2016, Yes on A.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Housing Now, Yes on A.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition A

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition A Were Submitted

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Would you like to

- Give back to your community?
- Meet your neighbors?
- Participate in the democratic process in San Francisco?

Be a Poll Worker on Tuesday, June 7!

It takes more than 2,500 poll workers to conduct an election. Poll workers operate polling places on Election Day and assist voters in many parts of the voting process. Some poll workers have volunteered during every election for decades. Poll workers include high school students learning on-the-job civics lessons, retirees, and hundreds of people who take a day off from their regular lives to be of service to San Francisco voters.

People who are bilingual in English and Spanish, Filipino, Vietnamese, Korean, Japanese, Cantonese, or Mandarin are highly encouraged to apply!

Poll workers attend a training class prior to the election. In class, all duties are explained in detail. Lead poll workers must also pick up materials before Election Day and transport them to their assigned polling place on the morning of the election.

Applicants must be legal residents of the United States and age 18 or older, or age 16 or older and attending high school in San Francisco. All positions are one-day assignments and pay between \$142 and \$195.

Adults interested in serving as a poll worker must apply in person at the Poll Worker Recruitment Office. The Recruitment Office is open every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., and is located at the Department of Elections in City Hall, Room 48. High school students do not need to come to the office in person; instead, they should visit sfelections.org/pollworker for instructions and to download an application.

For more information, visit sfelections.org/pollworker or call the Department of Elections Poll Worker Division at (415) 554-4395.

We look forward to having you join our poll worker team!

B**Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund**

Shall the City amend the Charter to extend the Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund until 2046 and give the Recreation and Park Department each year a minimum baseline amount from the General Fund in addition to the Fund set-aside of 2½ cents for each \$100 of assessed property value?

YES**NO****Digest** by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City's Recreation and Park Department (Department) operates and maintains over two hundred parks, as well as many playgrounds, recreation facilities and open spaces throughout San Francisco.

In 2000, San Francisco voters created the Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund (Fund). Every year, the City must set aside and deposit into the Fund a portion of the property tax it collects. The Department must use that money to provide park and recreational services and facilities. The current amount of the set-aside is 2½ cents for each \$100 of assessed property value.

The Fund will expire in 2031.

In addition to this set-aside, each year the Department also receives money from the City's General Fund. The City is not required to appropriate any specific amount for the Department beyond the set-aside in the Fund.

In 2000–2001, the Recreation and Park Department received 2.1% of the City's General Fund. That percentage dropped to 1.2% in the 2014–2015 fiscal year. A Parks Alliance budget analysis shows that, if the 2.1% had remained constant, the Department would now be receiving approximately \$89 million instead of \$50 million.

The Proposal: Proposition B would amend the Charter to:

- extend the Fund for an additional 15 years to 2046;
- require the City, beginning in fiscal year 2016–2017, to give the Department each year a minimum baseline amount from the General Fund, in addition to the Fund set-aside.

This baseline amount would be equal to the Department's share of the budget from the General Fund in fiscal year 2015–2016. Each year through fiscal year 2026–2027 the City would increase that baseline amount by \$3 million. After 2026–2027, the Controller would adjust the annual baseline amount based on the City's revenues. In any fiscal year, the City would not be required to make any increase if the City is facing a substantial budget deficit; and

- require the Department to determine whether low-income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities are receiving the same level of Department services and resources as the City as a whole. If the levels are not the same, the Department would have to develop a plan to correct these imbalances.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to extend the Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund until 2046 and require the City to give the Recreation and Park Department each year a minimum baseline amount from the General Fund in addition to the Fund set-aside.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to make these changes to the Charter.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

Should the proposed charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a significant impact on the cost of government.

The proposed amendment would create a new baseline funding requirement for parks, recreation, and open space that would grow over time. These funds are currently part of the City's General Fund discretion-

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 122. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

any revenues, available for any public purpose. As funds are shifted to meet the proposed baseline established in the amendment, other City spending would have to be reduced or new revenues identified to maintain current City service levels.

The Recreation and Parks Department receives approximately \$64 million from the City's General Fund to support its fiscal year (FY) 2015–16 budget. The proposed amendment would create a new baseline funding requirement, binding on the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, equal to this amount. This allocation would grow by \$3.0 million per year for the next ten fiscal years. After that, and prior to the sunset of the baseline in FY 2045–46, this baseline amount would be adjusted at the same rate as the percentage increase or decrease in the City's discretionary revenues. The amendment allows the City to temporarily suspend growth in baseline funding in years when the City forecasts a budget deficit of \$200 million or greater.

Additionally, the measure would extend the sunset date for an existing voter-approved set-aside for parks, recreation and open space by an additional 15 years. The existing Charter set-aside of City property tax revenues was approved by the voters in 2000. This set-aside is 2.5 cents per \$100 of the City's total assessed property value, budgeted at \$46 million in FY 2015–16. The proposed amendment would extend this set-aside by 15 years, moving its sunset date from FY 2030–31 to FY 2045–46. This set-aside is in addition to the General Fund budget for the department, and therefore in addition to the baseline established in the measure.

The proposed amendment requires Recreation and Parks to set goals and measures, develop a five year strategic plan and set annual operational and capital spending plans. The plans must be approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. A performance audit is required in the fourth year of the strategic plan cycle.

This proposed amendment is not in compliance with a non-binding, voter-adopted city policy regarding set-asides. The policy seeks to limit set-asides which reduce General Fund dollars that could otherwise be allocated by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors in the annual budget process.

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 23, 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted 9 to 2 to place Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Wiener, Yee.

No: Peskin, Tang.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 122. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

PROPOSITION B PROTECTS SAN FRANCISCO PARKS, PLAYGROUNDS AND OPEN SPACES

Proposition B provides just over \$1 billion in new, sustainable park funding for 30-years, without raising taxes.

Whether you take your kids to the playground, enjoy a walk on one of our many trails, play soccer, or simply sit on a park bench and enjoy a good book, our parks, playgrounds and open spaces serve as our city's backyards, and are essential to our quality of life.

Yet park funding as a share of the City's total budget has eroded over the years. Analysis by the nonprofit San Francisco Parks Alliance found that the Recreation and Park Department (RPD) annual allocation from the City's General Fund hasn't kept up with the growing City budget, leaving our parks in need of more stable funding to address park needs such as fixing broken playground equipment, replacing broken sprinklers to conserve water, and keeping trails cleared and safe.

Proposition B builds upon the Open Space Fund overwhelmingly passed by voters in 2000, fulfilling San Franciscans' intent to provide a sustainable funding source for parks.

Proposition B will ensure the City's General Fund contribution to RPD gradually increases over time, cannot fall below 2015-16 funding levels, and ensures stable funding for the next 30 years through 2045-46.

Proposition B also requires RPD to develop equity metrics and an analysis of funding and service levels in low-income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities, and to submit annual recommendations on how to provide equitable and sustainable funding for parks, playgrounds, and open spaces in every neighborhood of the city.

Protect and improve San Francisco's parks, playgrounds and open spaces in every neighborhood by voting Yes on Proposition B.

Protectsfparks.com

Supervisor Mark Farrell

Supervisor Jane Kim

Board President London Breed

Supervisor Eric Mar

Supervisor John Avalos

Supervisor Scott Wiener

Supervisor David Campos

Supervisor Norman Yee

Supervisor Malia Cohen

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition B

PROPOSITION B ENDANGERS FUNDING FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION, PUBLIC SAFETY, AND HOUSING

Prop. B would remove over \$1 billion in funding from San Francisco's general fund for 30 years, putting other budgetary priorities at risk.

Children's health, fire protection, paving the streets – **all these services and many others would have fewer resources to draw upon** in time of need if it passes.

Supervisors may assume they'll just be able to **raise taxes** to make up any resulting budgetary problems, but will voters agree?

Proponents insist Prop. B has safeguards assuring equitable funding to all neighborhoods. But according to the legislation's text, **even if the Controller determines the Recreation and Park Department (RPD) has failed to meet these requirements**, all the Board of Supervisors would be allowed to do is withhold 5% of RPD's budget at most!

Proponents also claim park funding has eroded as a share of the City's total budget. That's only true because the total municipal budget has grown *even more rapidly* than the parks' budget!

The April issue of San Francisco magazine reports **"San Francisco's budget has almost doubled over the last 10 years, from \$5.3 billion to nearly \$9 billion"** (<http://modernluxury.com/san-francisco/story/san-franciscos-incredible-expanding-budget>).

Meanwhile, **RPD's budget has increased substantially over the past decade, from \$100 million in 2005** (<http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/CITYWIDE-Czar-of-Rec-and-Park-has-high-2576441.php>) **to \$163 million last year** (<http://sfbay.ca/2015/01/15/city-parks-brighten-budget-forecast/>).

Unfortunately, like the rest of San Francisco's budget, **park funding is being eaten up by personnel costs**. Let's address *that* problem, not cannibalize other City services!

Vote NO on B!

Libertarian Party of San Francisco
www.LPSF.org

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

Proposition B is another transfer of power from elected officials to unelected bureaucrats (similar in this respect to Proposition AA).

It would take millions of dollars in spending authority away from elected legislators and put it in the hands of political appointees and career bureaucrats in the Recreation and Parks Department.

According to the measure's official legislative digest, The Board of Supervisors "would not have the power to adopt, reject, or modify the [department's] plans."

Why have Board members put such a measure on the ballot, one might wonder? Ducking responsibility, much?

Even if a Controller's audit "finds that the Department has not complied" with requirements for reporting, holding public hearings, establishing metrics to ensure equal distribution of resources to low-income neighborhoods, etc., the most the Board would be allowed to do is reduce the following year's departmental budget by 5%!

Prop. B would also eliminate the requirement that "New revenues from outside sources, such as grant or foundation support" be used "only for enhancement of park and recreational programs" (page 4).

In other words, opening the door for such funds to be spent on salaries, perks, or other overhead, rather than on park improvement!

With no guarantee that their donations won't be mis-spent, will "outside sources" still *want* to support the parks? Perhaps only in cases where the motive for giving is *not* to improve the parks, but to curry favor with those in power!

Besides increasing the portion of the municipal budget off-limits to legislators elected by the people, Prop. B would sneakily authorize the issuance of revenue bonds (incurring debt) without voter approval (pages 4-5).

Definitely last, though perhaps not least, this abdication of power to the bureaucracy wouldn't expire until 2046!

This is not good government. **Vote NO on B.**

Libertarian Party of San Francisco
www.LPSF.org

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition B

Proposition B Ensures Funding To Maintain and Improve Our Parks, Playgrounds and Open Spaces

San Franciscans of all ages enjoy our city's world-class parks, playgrounds, trails, recreation centers, skate parks, and soccer fields. We depend on these resources that contribute to our quality of life in our dense, urban environment.

While the Recreation and Park Department does an incredible job of maintaining our parks, City funds have not kept up with the maintenance needs that result from heavy use. Over 20 million people visit our park system every year.

In 2000-2001, the Recreation and Park Department received 2.1% of the City's General Fund. Since that time, the percentage of funds has dropped dramatically to 1.2% in 2014-2015.

The Parks Alliance's own budget analysis has shown that if the 2.1% had remained constant, RPD would now be receiving approximately \$89 million annually instead of \$50 million.

That reduction has left many needs to be fixed: Broken swings, leaking sprinklers, bathrooms in need of repair, grass that needs to be re-sod.

Proposition B provides sustainable funding for the next 30 years, without raising taxes. That sustainable funding will help RPD address the backlog of maintenance needs, and move forward with critical park improvements.

Prop B requires the city to collect data that will ensure parks in every neighborhood of our city receive equitable care and funding.

Please join us in protecting our parks, playgrounds and open space by voting Yes on Prop B.

San Francisco Parks Alliance

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B**PROP B MEANS BETTER PARKS**

Over the last 15 years our parks and recreation programs have been the victim of huge budget cuts. Recessions hurt all city departments but without charter protection Rec and Park has been hit the hardest.

Your YES VOTE on B will provide baseline funding for programs and facilities that San Franciscans use daily, without raising taxes.

Join business, labor and civic organizations in guaranteeing fair share budgeting for our parks and recreation programs, by voting YES on B.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and our 2,500 local businesses.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B**Environmental Leaders Support Prop B**

Proposition B is critical to the future of our City's parks, playgrounds and open spaces, securing the funding needed to maintain and improve our amazing park system today and for the next generation - without raising taxes.

People need nature – parks and open space are essential for our health and well-being. San Francisco is a special place in part because of our parks, and we should protect them.

As leading voices on behalf of our parks and environment, we are stewards of our neighborhood parks, seeing first hand what improvements and maintenance those parks and playgrounds need.

Prop B ensures the City's General Fund contribution to the Recreation and Park Department gradually increases over time, cannot fall below 2015-16 funding levels, and ensures stable funding for the next 30 years through 2045-46.

That sustainable funding will mean faster repairs on broken swings for neighborhood children; improved water conservation when leaking sprinklers are quickly fixed; paths cleared of unsafe branches; and repaired bathrooms that residents can use safely.

Join us in supporting this incredibly important measure that will safeguard our parks for generations to come.

Vote Yes On Prop B!

*The Nature Conservancy
San Francisco League of Conservation Voters*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on B, San Franciscans For Better, Sustainable Parks.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: The SF Parks Alliance.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B**Prop B Provides Equitable and Sustainable Funding for Parks in Every Neighborhood**

Prop B requires equitable and sustainable funding for parks, playgrounds and open spaces in every neighborhood.

These recreation areas are the backyards of many San Francisco residents, and often the safest place to get outside, exercise and visit with friends. That's why it is so critical that they are safe, clean and accessible for everyone. Prop B ensures equitable funding and treatment for those outdoor spaces in every neighborhood.

Prop B requires the Recreation and Park Department to annually assess whether disadvantaged neighborhoods are receiving the same level of services and resources as the rest of the city, and if those levels are not the same, RPD is required to correct those imbalances. This is an important and critical step we can take as residents to ensure every San Franciscan receives equitable services and resources.

Prop B ensures every San Francisco neighborhood receive the same level of services, and parks, playgrounds and open spaces are made as safe, clean and accessible as they are for residents in other neighborhoods.

Join us in supporting Prop B, for equitable, sustainable funding in our neighborhoods.

Park Partner Groups

*Dolores Parks Works
Friends of Alta Plaza Park
Friends of the AMP
Friends of Balboa Park Playground
Friends of Geneva Office Building and Powerhouse
Friends of Larsen Park
Friends of West Portal Playground
Residents For Noe Valley Town Square
SF Lawn Bowling Club
South Park Improvement Association*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on B, San Franciscans For Better, Sustainable Parks.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Parks Alliance.

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B**JOIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN VOTING YES ON PROPOSITION B**

The San Francisco Democratic Party strongly supports Proposition B, to protect our City's parks, playgrounds and open spaces in every neighborhood.

Prop B provides the sustainable funding needed to maintain and improve our parks, playgrounds and open space that residents depend on every day.

In our dense urban city, the parks and playgrounds are an oasis where we can exercise, swing and jump on jungle gyms, talk with our neighbors, or sit quietly and read.

But while we enjoy a world class parks system, the allocation from the City's General Fund has not kept up with the growing city budget, leaving our parks and playgrounds in need of more stable funding to fix maintenance needs such as broken playground equipment, replacing leaking sprinklers to conserve water, and keeping hiking trails cleared and safe.

Join fellow Democrats in supporting Prop B!

San Francisco Democratic Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on B, San Franciscans For Better, Sustainable Parks.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: San Francisco Parks Alliance.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B

Join San Francisco School Kids Need Prop B

Our city parks and playgrounds are essential partners to our schools, working in concert to ensure children are getting the physical exercise and fresh air they need to stay healthy and focused in the classroom.

Students and recreational athletes play on city fields and playgrounds every day, during and after school. Prop B will make sure those fields and playgrounds are maintained in a safe condition to protect children who depend on those outdoor resources.

Improving and maintaining our outdoor recreation spaces is a constant effort. With Prop B, the Recreation and Park Department will finally have the sustainable funding it needs fix broken swings, replace unsafe equipment, improve and maintain park bathrooms, and help make play fields safer.

Join our school community in helping to maintain and improve our children's health and well-being by voting Yes on Prop B.

*School Board President Matt Haney**
*School Board Vice President Shamann Walton**
*School Board Commissioner Sandra Lee Fewer**
*School Board Commissioner Hydra Mendoza**
*School Board Commissioner Emily Murase**
*School Board Commissioner Rachel Norton**
*School Board Commissioner Jill Wynns**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Yes on B, San Franciscans For Better, Sustainable Parks.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: SF Parks Alliance.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition B**Local Democrats Support Parks and Open Space!**

Parks and open space are critical to our San Francisco neighborhoods. Proposition B will help ensure that there always be adequate funding to maintain safe and beautiful parks for our children and families. Please join a coalition of local Democrats and neighborhood leaders and vote YES on Prop B!

*Gary McCoy; Long-time San Francisco Democrat**
*Keith Baraka; Long-time San Francisco Democrat**
*Mary Jung; Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**
*Francis Tsang; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**
*Arlo Hale Smith; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**
*Rebecca Prozan; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**
Josh Arce; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
*Leah Pimentel; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**
*Kat Anderson; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**
*Marjan Philhour; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Tom Hsieh For DCCC.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition B

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition B Were Submitted

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.



C

Affordable Housing Requirements

Shall the City amend the Charter to increase affordable housing requirements for private developers of new market-rate housing projects of 25 or more units until the Board of Supervisors passes an ordinance changing those requirements and also authorize the Board of Supervisors to change affordable housing requirements by ordinance?

YES



NO



Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City's Charter generally requires private developers of new market-rate housing to provide affordable housing (sometimes called inclusionary housing). A private developer can meet this requirement in one of three ways:

- pay a fee based on the cost to build affordable housing units equal to approximately 20% of the total units being developed;
- make at least 12% of the on-site housing units affordable; or
- create new affordable units off-site, equal to approximately 20% of the total units.

A rental unit counts toward these requirements if it is affordable to households earning up to 55% of the area median income. A unit for sale counts toward these requirements if it is affordable to households earning up to 90% of the area median income.

These requirements can be modified only by amending the Charter through a ballot measure.

The Proposal: Proposition C would amend the Charter to:

- increase affordable housing requirements for private developers of new market-rate housing projects of 25 or more units until the Board of Supervisors passes an ordinance changing those requirements and
- authorize the Board of Supervisors to change affordable housing requirements by ordinance.

Until the Board of Supervisors passes an ordinance changing affordable housing requirements for private developers of new market-rate housing, the following requirements would apply:

- for housing development projects of 10 or more dwellings but fewer than 25 dwellings, the project must:

- 1) pay a fee based on the cost to build affordable housing units equal to approximately 20% of the total units being developed;
- 2) make at least 12% of on-site units affordable; or
- 3) create new affordable units off-site, equal to 20% of the project's units;

- for housing development projects of 25 or more dwellings, the project must:

- 1) pay a fee based on the cost to build affordable housing units equal to 33% of the total units being developed;
- 2) make at least 25% of the on-site units affordable, with 15% of the units affordable to low-income households and 10% affordable to middle-income households; or
- 3) create new affordable units off-site, equal to 33% of the project's units, with 20% of the units affordable to low-income households and 13% affordable to middle-income households.

A rental unit would count as low income if it is affordable to households earning up to 55% of the area median income. A unit for sale would count as low income if it is affordable to households earning up to 80% of the area median income.

A rental unit would count as middle income if it is affordable to households earning up to 100% of the area median income. A unit for sale would count as middle income if it is affordable to households earning up to 120% of the area median income.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 125. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

The chart below shows Area Median Income (AMI) for certain households in San Francisco:

Income Definition	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person
55% OF MEDIAN	\$39,250	\$44,850	\$50,450	\$56,050
80% OF MEDIAN	\$57,100	\$65,200	\$73,350	\$81,500
100% OF MEDIAN	\$71,350	\$81,500	\$91,700	\$101,900
120% OF MEDIAN	\$85,600	\$97,800	\$110,050	\$122,300

A “YES” Vote Means: If you vote “yes,” you want to amend the Charter to:

- increase affordable housing requirements for private developers of new market-rate housing projects of 25 or more units until the Board of Supervisors passes an ordinance changing those requirements and
- authorize the Board of Supervisors to change affordable housing requirements by ordinance.

A “NO” Vote Means: If you vote “no,” you do not want to make these changes to the Charter.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have both positive and negative impacts on City revenues. The City is likely to realize an increase in fees paid to develop affordable housing, an increase in the proportion of affordable housing units required in larger housing developments, and a reduction in property tax revenues given the lower taxable assessed values of these units. The magnitude of these changes will be affected by the requirements established in future ordinances, the impact of established fees on the rate of new housing unit construction, market conditions, and other factors.

The proposed amendment would remove the current Charter-mandated limits on the affordable and inclusionary housing requirements and fees that are applied to housing developments. The Board of Supervisors would instead be authorized to change these requirements and fees by ordinance.

The Charter amendment specifies varying interim requirements that would be in place for developments of 10 to 25 units and for developments of 25 units or more during the period between the passage of the

amendment and the enactment of a future ordinance. These interim requirements are higher than those currently established in the Charter, and are likely to increase the proportion of units in these developments that are affordable or result in an increase in the one-time fees paid to the City to develop affordable housing. Increases in fees paid at these interim levels are likely to be offset by reductions in property taxes given lower assessed taxable value of affordable housing units versus market rate units. To the extent that requirements established in this interim period or in future ordinances slow the development of market-rate housing in the City, the loss of property tax revenues would be more pronounced.

This statement does not address the potential impacts of the proposed amendment on the local economy or housing prices generally.

How “C” Got on the Ballot

On March 1, 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted 11 to 0 to place Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener, Yee.

No: None.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 125. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

San Franciscans are being forced out of our city every day because there is simply not enough affordable housing. Meanwhile, luxury housing developments are being built all over the city.

Proposition C is a real solution that requires new housing development to include more options for middle-class and working San Franciscans. This housing will be paid for by private developers, not taxpayers.

Proposition C:

- **Increases the percentage of affordable housing** that private market-rate developers must provide;
- **More than doubles the affordable housing requirement** for large projects from 12% to 25%;
- **Includes middle-income affordable housing** requirements for the first time, so San Franciscans like teachers and nurses can afford to live here.
- **Encourages the creation of on-site affordable housing** to promote diverse, mixed-income development in our neighborhoods.

After the recession and during this housing crisis, it is time to increase affordable housing requirements.

Importantly, Prop C allows the Board of Supervisors to adjust the requirements higher or lower based on future economic conditions to ensure that we always produce the maximum number of economically feasible affordable housing units.

Proposition C was created by a broad, diverse coalition of elected leaders, advocates and organizations who work to prevent evictions, slow the rising costs of rent and homeownership, and provide affordable housing to those most in need.

Please join us on June 7th and vote YES on C.

Supervisor Jane Kim

Supervisor Aaron Peskin

State Senator Mark Leno

Assemblymember Phil Ting

Affordable Housing Alliance

Council of Community Housing Organizations

Tenants and Owners Development Corporation

United Educators of San Francisco

Housing Rights Committee

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

SO-CALLED "AFFORDABLE HOUSING" HAS BECOME AN EXPENSIVE AND WASTEFUL DRAIN OF SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS' MONEY AND GOVERNMENTAL RESOURCES – WITH ENDLESS POLITICAL GAMES BEING PLAYED:

San Francisco is territorially the smallest of California's 58 counties. It is already heavily builtup, with little room for further construction. Some building developers — including the management of the Parkmerced rental complex — hope to tear down existing housing and replace it with larger highrise residential structures.

In the case of Parkmerced, which currently has about 8,000 residents on about 150 acres, it might be possible to pack 30,000 persons into the development. The complex, however, is located near the San Andreas Faultline — the source of the April 18, 1906 San Francisco Earthquake and Fire.

How well highrise buildings of the City will fare in a future seismic event similar to 1906 remains to be seen. I'm inclined to be sceptical, given that the building codes of Japan, Chile, and other high risk earth-

quake locations are better than San Francisco and California's rules.

Meanwhile, our local political figures continue to promote what they call "affordable housing", coming up with plenty of bond issues, ballot measures, and programs of very questionable value.

All sorts of giveaways and cash offers are made to building developers, lots of campaign donations of course being raised by the "City Fathers".

Forget all the dream sell-words.

Vote "NO!" on wasteful Proposition C.

*Terence Faulkner**

State of California Certified Farmers Market Advisory Board Member (1999 to 2005)

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Opponent's Argument Against Proposition C

THE WHOLE AREA OF SO-CALLED "AFFORDABLE HOUSING" HAS BECOME AN ORGY OF POLITICAL PATRONAGE AND GIFTS TO FAVORED BUILDING DEVELOPERS.

All the selective political legislation involving so-called "*affordable housing*" involves payments to be made by certain building developers to be put into special city government accounts — which, in turn, will raise the costs of construction for the original developers... so that they will be forced to charge more to home or condo buyers.

The resulting "*affordable housing funds*" will then be used to bid up the price of more real-estate and be given, one way or the other, to a second group of politically chosen building developers to increase their profits.

The second group of building developers will, hopefully, make lots of money...and, again hopefully, will make plenty of political campaign donations to candidates and issues favored by the public officials who provided the "*affordable housing funds*".

That is all you need to know about so-called "*affordable housing*" and "*affordable housing funds*".

Vote "NO!" on Proposition "C".

*Dr. Terence Faulkner**

Former Member of San Francisco City Government's Cable Television Task Force

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition C

Proposition C was created by a diverse coalition representing communities across San Francisco. It was passed unanimously by the Board of Supervisors. And it has earned the support of individuals, community leaders and advocacy organizations throughout the city.

The city is uniting behind Prop C because it addresses the pressing issue of affordable housing with a common-sense, pragmatic approach. It significantly raises the affordable housing options for low-income and middle-income San Franciscans *in every housing project of 25 units or more*. And it does so without costing taxpayers a dime.

Prop C immediately raises the percentage of affordable housing required in large projects from 12% to 25%. Contrary to the opponent's argument, it actually *encourages* the creation of on-site affordable housing, *instead* of asking developers to contribute to a housing fund.

As economic conditions change, Prop C also enables the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to make

adjustments in the affordable housing requirements. This ensures that the city can set the requirements at the point that is most economically feasible for producing the maximum number of affordable homes.

The housing crisis is forcing many of our fellow San Franciscans to leave the city. This June, we have an opportunity to increase the affordable housing options we so desperately need. Please join us in voting Yes on C.

*Supervisor Jane Kim
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Norman Yee*

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Teachers need Proposition C!**

San Francisco public school teachers, like many working San Franciscans, continue to struggle to afford to live in the city where we teach. Proposition C will make a difference, especially for paraprofessionals and newer teachers, because it requires market-rate housing developers to provide housing options for both lower-income AND middle-income families. Help San Francisco's educators afford to live in San Francisco, near their schools and as part of the community. Vote Yes on Prop C.

United Educators of San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Make our city more affordable now**

San Francisco renters are suffering from skyrocketing rents and climbing evictions. Housing costs are so high that only 11 percent of San Franciscans earn enough to afford today's home prices.

Proposition C will add more below-market housing units to help make our City more affordable now.

Please vote Yes on C*San Francisco Council of Community Housing Organizations**Affordable Housing Alliance**Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: The authors.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**State Senator Mark Leno supports Proposition C**

As Supervisor, I was proud to author and pass San Francisco's first law mandating that market-rate housing developers provide at least 15% affordable units. Recognizing the severity of our housing crisis, Prop C appropriately increases this requirement, which was lowered during the recession. It also returns the ability to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to adjust requirements based on economic conditions to ensure that we are building the maximum number of affordable units at any time. I urge you to vote Yes on C.

State Senator Mark Leno

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Prop C delivers**

Rent prices and tenant evictions are hurting every San Francisco community. Prop C provides affordable housing in every neighborhood. Join us and vote YES on C.

*Asian Neighborhood Design**PODER**Chinatown Community Development Center**TODCO**San Francisco Housing Development Corporation**Dolores Street Community Services*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**YES ON C FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING**

We represent 80 community-based San Francisco non-profits dedicated to meeting critical health and human service needs. Prop C provides opportunities for low and middle-income families impacted by the housing crisis. It's a good first step, but we need to go further to address people struggling with homelessness and poverty.

San Francisco Human Services Network

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Prop C: protecting the people of San Francisco**

San Francisco's development policies have allowed luxury housing to displace thousands of San Franciscans. Too many of us have been forced on the street and out of our city. Prop C brings the power back to neighborhoods to be able to require developers to build higher amounts of desperately needed affordable housing.

*Senior & Disability Action**Community Tenants Association**Housing Rights Committee**San Francisco Rising Alliance**San Francisco ACCE**Chinese Progressive Association*

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

YES on C – Affordable Housing for San Franciscans

Our City's affordable housing requirements were lowered during the economic recession. The economy has rebounded but residents are struggling in a housing crisis – homeownership costs and rent are simply out of reach for too many people.

Proposition C will create new affordable housing for low and middle-income residents, including new opportunities for homeownership for renters, seniors, and working families.

Homeownership San Francisco

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Proposition C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Join Working San Franciscans in Support of Prop C

The teachers, nurses, trades people, gardeners and other services and retail employees who work in San Francisco can no longer afford to live here. Proposition C requires for the first time that developers of luxury housing provide options for middle-income and working San Franciscans. We need this solution now.

Jobs with Justice

UNITE HERE Local 2

National Union of Healthcare Workers

California Nurses Association

SEIU United Service Workers West

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

For an affordable and sustainable city – YES ON C

San Francisco's affordability crisis has a direct impact on our environment. When central cities like San Francisco are affordable to people of different incomes, there is reduction in suburban sprawl, greenhouse gas emissions, and habitat loss. In recent years, however, San Francisco has become increasingly unaffordable, forcing many people to live outside the City

and creating more car commuters. Yes on C can help reverse that trend by dramatically increasing affordable housing options. Please vote YES on C.

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Providing affordable and supportive housing

Every day we see the evidence of our housing crisis as more and more San Franciscans struggle to pay rent and many end up without homes and living on the street. Prop C is a strong initiative that will bring the city closer to our goals of providing affordable housing for all who need it. Please join the diverse coalition of housing advocates, nonprofit organizations, and neighborhood leaders who care about the people of San Francisco. Vote Yes on C.

Community Housing Partnership

Coalition on Homelessness

Hospitality House

Faithful Fools Street Ministry

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

African American leaders support Prop C

San Francisco's African American population has been among the hardest hit by our continued housing crises, resulting in a drastic exodus of our community. As community leaders and elected officials, we are supporting solutions at every level to reverse this trend and provide affordable housing opportunities in our neighborhoods. Proposition C will help address the displacement of San Francisco's African American residents and provide greater affordable housing options in our neighborhoods. Please vote Yes on C.

London Breed, President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Former Supervisor Sophie Maxwell

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.



Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

San Francisco's Latino community is united for Prop C

Rents and evictions continue to rise, and Latino neighborhoods like the Mission and Outer Mission have been especially hard hit. We can take action to create more affordable housing by voting for Proposition C.

Supervisor John Avalos

Supervisor David Campos

Mark Sanchez, former President of the San Francisco Board of Education

*Josue Arguelles, Co-Director, Young Workers United**

*Myrna Melgar, Building Inspection Commission Vice-President**

*Oscar Grande, Community Organizer, PODER**

*Brigitte Davila, San Francisco Community College Trustee **

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

LGBT leaders and housing advocates say Yes on C

In San Francisco, nearly one-third of the homeless population identifies as LGBT and there are not nearly enough shelter beds for all who need one. We need new solutions to provide affordable housing right now! Please join us in voting Yes on C.

Supervisor David Campos

Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club

AIDS Housing Alliance/San Francisco

Former Assemblymember Tom Ammiano

Former Supervisor Bevan Dufty

Community College Board President Rafael Mandelman

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

An Affordable Housing Solution for San Francisco

Proposition C is a common-sense, workable solution that will help increase affordable housing options for every community in San Francisco. Our current affordable housing requirement for new development was set during the recession. As a result, the City is locked

into affordable housing requirement levels that are now too low. Prop C not only increases the percentage of affordable housing required, but gives city lawmakers the ability to adjust the formula in future years to match evolving economic conditions. Join the coalition for more affordable housing in San Francisco and vote Yes on C.

Assemblymember Phil Ting

Supervisor Eric Mar

Supervisor Jane Kim

Supervisor Norman Yee

Sandra Lee Fewer, Board of Education Commissioner

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Democratic leaders support Prop C

San Francisco's current housing crisis is one of the worst we have seen in our many decades of community work and public service. It is taking a toll on every neighborhood and all of our diverse communities. Proposition C will have an immediate impact on the crisis by requiring that luxury housing developers make a greater contribution to supply both low-income and middle-income housing options for San Franciscans. Please join us in support of Prop C.

Former Mayor Art Agnos

*California Democratic Party Chair John Burton**

Former San Francisco Democratic Party Chair Jane Morrison

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C

Prop C -- a real plan for affordable housing

Proposition C is a powerful tool for creating the affordable housing San Francisco so urgently needs. It will have a direct and beneficial impact on our housing crisis. Please vote YES on C.

*Planning Commissioner Cindy Wu**

*Planning Commissioner Kathrin Moore**

*Planning Commission Vice-President Dennis Richards**

*Former Planning Commissioner Dennis Antenore**

Former Planning Commissioner Doug Engmann

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Former Planning Commissioner Hisashi (Bill) Sugaya

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Veterans support Proposition C**

San Francisco's veterans and their families deserve safe, affordable, quality housing. Join us in voting YES on C.

*Swords to Plowshares
Veterans Equity Center*

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**San Francisco Neighbors for Prop C**

Residents are being priced out of San Francisco. Neighborhood businesses and nonprofits have closed or been forced to move. Neighborhood character is deteriorating. We need Prop C to help keep San Francisco neighborhoods vibrant and diverse.

*San Francisco Neighborhood Network
Gerry Crowley, North Beach/Telegraph Hill*
Marlayne Morgan, Cathedral Hill*
Dennis Antenore, Inner Sunset*
David Elliott Lewis, Ph.D., Tenderloin*
James Joannides, Middle Polk*
Paul Wermer, Lower Pacific Heights*
Mary Anne Miller, Parkside*
Tony Kelly, Potrero Hill*
Tes Welborn, Haight-Ashbury*
Suzanne Markel-Fox, Middle Polk**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Affordable San Francisco for All, Yes on Prop C.

The sole contributor to the true source recipient committee: Yerba Buena Neighborhood Consortium.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**SF Democrats Say - Building More Housing!**

Keep San Francisco affordable. Proposition C will help build more affordable housing.

Vote Yes on C!

San Francisco Democratic Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. SF for Everyone, 2. SF Housing Now, 3. San Franciscans for Affordable Housing, Jobs and Parks.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Local Democrats Support Affordable Housing Now!**

San Francisco needs affordable housing now! Proposition C creates more affordable housing in San Francisco and requires real estate developers to give their fair share to affordability. Please join a coalition of local Democrats and housing activists and vote Yes on Prop C!

Keith Baraka; Long-time San Francisco Democrat
Mary Jung; Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee*
Josh Arce; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Francis Tsang; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee*
Rebecca Prozan; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee*
Emily Murase; San Francisco School Board Member**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Tom Hsieh For DCCC.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition C**Paid Argument AGAINST Proposition C**

Prop C will reduce the overall amount of housing built and thereby increase displacement by 4%.

More information: www.sfbarf.org

Mike Ege

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Sonja Trauss.



Are You Having Difficulty Voting Because of a Disability?

CALL: 1-888-569-7955

**Disability Rights California will operate a statewide
Election Day Hotline:**

7:00 AM to 8:00 PM on Election Day: June 7, 2016

We'll help voters with disabilities have a successful voting experience and identify issues we can address before the November General Election.

D Office of Citizen Complaints Investigations

Shall the Office of Citizen Complaints investigate any incident occurring within the City in which a San Francisco police officer fires a gun killing or physically injuring someone?

YES

NO



Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: The City's Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) is responsible for investigating complaints of San Francisco police misconduct. The OCC does not investigate complaints filed by police officers against other police officers. It is not required to investigate incidents involving police officers if no one files a complaint.

The Proposal: Proposition D would require the OCC to investigate any incident occurring within the City in which a San Francisco police officer fires a gun killing or physically injuring someone, even if no one files a complaint.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want the OCC to investigate any incident occurring within the City in which a San Francisco police officer fires a gun killing or physically injuring someone.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to accept this addition to the current law.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

Should the proposed initiative ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a minimal effect on the cost of government.

The ordinance requires that the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) investigate all incidents in which a uniformed police officer discharges a weapon resulting in injury or death. Over the most recent five year period, there have been approximately 31 such incidents and eight complaints related to them. If officer-involved shooting incidents continue at similar rates as in prior years, approximately six additional investigations would be required each year.

The salary and benefit cost for an OCC investigator ranges up to approximately \$140,000 depending on their experience and seniority. The overall budget for the OCC was approximately \$5 million as of the fiscal year 2015–2016 budget. The ordinance requirements can be expected to also increase some administrative and training costs for the agency.

How "D" Got on the Ballot

On March 1, 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted 11 to 0 to place Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener, Yee.

No: None.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 127. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

Yes on Proposition D - Bringing Accountability and Transparency to Public Safety

In the past five years there have been 35 officer involved shootings. Of the 35 shootings, only eight were investigated, an investigation rate of less than 25%. Citizens rightfully believe that any incident that involves the shooting of an individual by an officer will be met with a high level of accountability and transparency to the public — this current structure lacks accountability. Currently, investigations are only triggered when a shooting results in a death or when a formal complaint is filed with the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC).

Proposition D will immediately require the OCC to perform an independent and impartial investigation into all Officer involved shootings when the shooting results in a death or injury.

In other municipalities where similar accountability have been instituted officer involved shootings have dramatically declined, even to zero in some cases. Passing Proposition D will enhance government trans-

parency, increase accountability and improve community-police relations.

Vote Yes on Proposition D!

*Supervisor Malia Cohen
President London Breed
Supervisor Scott Wiener
Supervisor Mark Farrell
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Jane Kim
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor Aaron Peskin
Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Katy Tang*

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

THE EARLY HISTORY OF GOLD RUSH SAN FRANCISCO WAS MARKED BY ILLEGAL HANGINGS, MOB VIOLENCE, AND VERY WEAK POLICE SERVICES:

At the southern end of San Francisco's Lake Merced, just a few feet over the San Mateo County line, two men met on a morning in 1859 to fight a gun duel. One was California's United States Senator David Broderick, who was opposed to slavery. The other was former California Chief Justice of the Supreme Court David Terry, who had pro-Southern views and favored slavery.

Terry shot and killed Broderick.

No legal officials from San Francisco nor San Mateo County tried to stop the duel.

Fearing public anger, Justice Terry left California, moving to the South and later joining the Confederate Army. Broderick's murder later became an issue in the election for President, Abraham Lincoln narrowly carrying California by about 6,000 votes per elector in 1860.

Proposition "D" needs to be rewritten to protect the rights of policemen to deal with armed and dangerous suspects...like David Terry.

After the Civil War, Terry returned to California, again to practice law. One day in court, United States Supreme Court Justice Stephen Field, a Lincoln appointee, said something David Terry didn't like. Terry tried to stab the judge, being shot dead by his Federal guard.

The OCC might approve that shooting, but vote **"NO!"** on Proposition "D".

*Terence Faulkner**
United States President Reagan's Federal Executive Awards Committeeman (1988)

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Opponent's Argument Against Proposition D

PROPOSITION "D" – CALLING FOR AN OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS (CCO) – NEEDS TO BE CAREFULLY REWRITTEN TO PROTECT LEGAL DUE PROCESS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND CITIZENS:

The teenage boys engaging in deadly swordplay in the streets of Renaissance Verona in William Shakespeare's "*Romeo and Juliet*" reflect the law and order conditions in many of the cities of Europe, Latin America, and the United States until fairly modern times. Cops were not there.

Here in the United States, at the beginning of the 19th Century, Vice-President Aaron Burr shot Washington's former Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton dead in a duel. Again, there were no authorities to stop them.

When British statesman Sir Robert Peel (1788–1850) finally organized London's police system, he had to agree to only arm his "Bobbies" with nightsticks.

Proposition D, regarding the proposed Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), goes a bit too far: "The OCC shall conduct a complete investigation of any incident occurring within the City and County of San Francisco in which a member of the uniformed ranks of the San Francisco Police Department discharges a firearm

resulting in the physical injury or death of a person, even if the discharge is accidental...under this Section 96.11."

Minor accidents occur with guns...Lawful shootings of violent felons attempting murders, robberies, burglaries, and rapes also happen. Unfortunate events take place.

I know of one retired policeman who won several Medals of Valor, saved several lives, and even jumped into the San Francisco Bay to save a man from drowning. He also accidentally wounded a fellow officer while arresting a violent suspect. A lot of policemen can tell you similar stories. Common sense is needed.

Proposition "D" needs to be rewritten. Vote "NO!" on Proposition "D".

*Dr. Terence Faulkner**
County Central Committeeman

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition D

Don't be fooled! Proposition D is not an attack on the integrity of our police officers. Proposition D is a narrowly crafted measure that ensures there is balance and equity in the investigation of officer involved shootings - whether they are accidental or justified. Police chiefs, union representatives, grassroots organizations, and community leaders all across the country agree transparency builds trust and legitimacy between the public and law enforcement. This measure is a critical part of a systematic approach to keeping everyone in our communities safe and protecting the rights of all those involved during police encounters.

If you believe in accountability, if you believe in transparency - vote YES on Proposition D.

Supervisor Malia Cohen
President London Breed
Supervisor Scott Wiener
Supervisor Mark Farrell
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor John Avalos
Supervisor Aaron Peskin

Supervisor Norman Yee
Supervisor Katy Tang

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition D

Fair and impartial investigations on police use of force by the Office of Citizen Complaints will be mandated by this ballot measure.

Vote Yes on D!

San Francisco Democratic Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. SF for Everyone, 2. SF Housing Now, 3. San Franciscans for Affordable Housing, Jobs and Parks.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition D

The public's trust in our law enforcement agencies is essential. It is key to the stability of our City and the integrity of our criminal justice system Proposition D gives us the transparency and accountability we need in public safety.

*Suzy Loftus, President Police Commission**

*Julius Turman, Vice President Police Commission**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco United to bring Accountability and Transparency to Public Safety.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition D

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition D Were Submitted

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

You Can Stop Receiving This Paper Pamphlet

State and municipal laws allow voters to stop receiving a Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail and read it online instead.

To stop mail delivery of your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot OR to resume mail delivery if you previously had it stopped:

- Complete and mail this form, or
- Fill out the form at sfelections.org/viponline



Submit this form at least 50 days before an election for the change to take effect for that election and onward. If your request is received after this deadline, the change will likely take effect for the next election.



Go to voterguide.sfelections.org to read the online version of this pamphlet instead.

Stop mail delivery of the Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

About 40 days before an election, your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot will be available at sfelections.org/toolkit. The Department of Elections will send an email to the address you have provided on this form. (If the email address is invalid, we must send you the information by mail.)

Restart mail delivery of the Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

If you stopped receiving your Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail, you can restart mail delivery by submitting this form at least 50 days prior to an election.

☐ I do not want to receive my Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail. I'll use the online version instead.

☐ I stopped receiving my Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot by mail, but I would like to start receiving it by mail again.

COMPLETE ALL FIELDS

Printed Full Name

Date of Birth (MM/DD/YYYY)

Home Address (Number, Street, Apt./Unit, ZIP Code)

Email Address (name@domain.end) This email address will be kept confidential pursuant to California Government Code § 6254.4 and Elections Code § 2194, and legally may be provided to a candidate for office, a ballot measure committee, or other person for election, scholarly, journalistic, political, or governmental purposes, as determined by the Secretary of State.

Signature

Date

Mail this form to: Department of Elections, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 48, San Francisco, CA 94102

E Paid Sick Leave

Shall the City amend the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to parallel broader state law provisions without reducing the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance's coverage and allow employees to use paid sick leave hours for the broader purposes authorized by state law?

YES

NO

Digest by the Ballot Simplification Committee

The Way It Is Now: In 2006, San Francisco voters adopted the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance (PSLO), which requires employers to provide employees with one hour of paid sick leave for every 30 hours worked in San Francisco.

Under the PSLO, accrual of paid sick leave hours begins 90 days after the first day of employment. An employee who leaves a job and is rehired by the same employer is not entitled to have any unused paid sick leave reinstated.

California enacted a paid sick leave law, which became effective on July 1, 2015. It does not override the PSLO and in some ways provides broader protections for employees. Employers must comply with both the PSLO and the state law. The City can enforce only the PSLO.

In many instances, the number of hours of paid sick leave available to an employee under the PSLO is greater than the number of hours available under state law. For example, the state law allows an employer to provide the employee at the beginning of each year with only 24 hours or three days of paid sick leave for the year. Under the PSLO, the employer must provide one hour for every 30 hours worked up to a cap of 40 hours for employers with fewer than 10 employees. For employers with 10 or more employees, the cap is 72 hours.

The Proposal: Proposition E would amend the PSLO to parallel broader state law provisions so that, with some exceptions, an employer who complies with the PSLO would also comply with state law.

Proposition E would add provisions to the PSLO consistent with broader state law so that

- employees would begin to accrue paid sick leave under the PSLO on the first day of employment;
- employees who leave a job and are rehired by the same employer within a year would have their unused PSLO sick leave reinstated.

An employee could use paid sick leave for the broader purposes authorized by state law. Specifically, in addition to current uses

- an employee could use PSLO paid sick leave for legal or other purposes when the employee is a victim of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault;
- employees could use PSLO paid sick leave to care for a biological, adoptive or foster parent, step-parent, or guardian of their spouse or registered partner, or the employee's guardian when the employee was a minor.

Under Proposition E, if an employer provides an employee with three days of paid sick leave at the beginning of the year under state law, those three days would be treated as an "advance" on paid sick leave not yet accrued under the PSLO.

Proposition E would also authorize the Board of Supervisors to amend the PSLO to adopt provisions parallel to state or federal law in order to provide broader protections or coverage to employees.

A "YES" Vote Means: If you vote "yes," you want to amend the PSLO to parallel broader state law provisions without reducing the PSLO's coverage and allow employees to use paid sick leave hours for the broader purposes authorized by state law.

A "NO" Vote Means: If you vote "no," you do not want to make these changes.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 128. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Ben Rosenfield has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

The proposed ordinance would align the City's paid sick leave ordinance passed by the voters in November 2006 with current California Labor Code requirements. Existing protections and benefits for employees provided under the City's current ordinance are not materially affected and in some cases, such as in the authorized use of sick leave, the law would become more flexible. Since 2015 the City's Office of Labor Standards Enforcement has provided guidance and materials for San Francisco employers to assist with compliance with both the local and state requirements.

In addition the proposed ordinance would allow the Board of Supervisors to amend the City's laws in this area to conform to any future changes in State law.

How "E" Got on the Ballot

On February 23, 2016, the Board of Supervisors voted 11 to 0 to place Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

Yes: Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Peskin, Tang, Wiener, Yee.

No: None.

This measure requires 50%+1 affirmative votes to pass.

The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow. The full text begins on page 128. Some of the words used in the ballot digest are explained starting on page 81.

Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition E

Yes on E: Better Paid Sick Leave

In 2006, San Francisco was first in the nation to ensure employees could earn paid sick days when voters passed the measure into law. In 2014, California's Legislature passed a measure that contains different provisions. With Prop E San Francisco will adopt the stronger parts of each to ensure workers have access to paid sick days and streamline requirements, making it easier for small businesses to comply.

Start earning sick leave from the first day on the job.

State law begins accrual on the first day of employment, while local law begins at the 91st day. Proposition E guarantees workers begin accruing sick days on their first day on the job.

Simplify employer posting requirements and worker notification.

This proposal requires the City to provide businesses with a single poster, combining notice requirements of state and local laws, pending approval by the state. It also provides workers notice of their sick leave balances on the wage statement they already receive.

Expand uses of sick leave to include domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

State law expands situations when sick leave could be used to include circumstances related to domestic violence, sexual assault and/or stalking. This ordinance ensures local law also includes these provisions.

Ensure timely payment of sick leave.

This proposal requires employers pay employees for any usage of sick days no later than the next paycheck after the leave was taken.

For better sick leave, vote Yes on E.

Mayor Ed Lee

No Rebuttal or Opponent's Argument Against Proposition E Was Submitted

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E**PROP E CORRECTS OUR SICK LEAVE LAW**

Mayor Lee and eleven Supervisors put Proposition E on the ballot so employers can comply with both state and local paid sick leave laws without reducing employee benefits. This corrective measure brings these laws into conformity.

Join the Mayor, all eleven Supervisors, business and labor by voting YES on E.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and our 2,500 local businesses.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E

Amend the City's Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to cut down on government bureaucracy without reducing existing employee protections.

Vote Yes on E!

San Francisco Democratic Party

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee.

The three largest contributors to the true source recipient committee: 1. SF for Everyone, 2. SF Housing Now, 3. San Franciscans for Affordable Housing, Jobs and Parks.

Paid Argument IN FAVOR of Proposition E**Local Democrats Support Clean Government!**

It's simple – Proposition E amends the city's Paid Sick Leave Ordinance to run parallel with existing state law. This will simplify the rules our local business have to comply with and raise working standards for everybody. Please join a coalition of local Democrats, local business owners, and workers in voting Yes on Prop E!

Joel Engardio; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

*Francis Tsang; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Tom Hsieh; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Josh Arce; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Leah Pimentel; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Marjan Philhour; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Rebecca Prozan; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Kat Anderson; Member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Mary Jung; Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee**

*Emily Murase; San Francisco School Board Member**

*Keith Baraka; Long-time San Francisco Democrat**

*Gary McCoy; Long-time San Francisco Democrat**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

The true source(s) of funds for the printing fee of this argument: Tom Hsieh For DCCC.

End of Paid Arguments IN FAVOR of Proposition E

No Paid Arguments AGAINST Proposition E Were Submitted

Arguments are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency. Arguments are printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

AA**San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Program.**

San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Program. To protect San Francisco Bay for future generations by reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins, improving water quality, restoring habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, protecting communities from floods, and increasing shoreline public access, shall the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority authorize a parcel tax of \$12 per year, raising approximately \$25 million annually for twenty years with independent citizen oversight, audits, and all funds staying local?

YES**NO****Impartial Analysis of "AA"**

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority was created by the State of California to fund projects to protect and restore the San Francisco Bay. The Authority does not receive any dedicated local, state or federal funding to underwrite such shoreline projects.

The Authority has placed on the ballot Measure AA; which if approved by two-thirds of the voters voting on the Measure, would assess a special parcel tax of \$12 per year on each parcel of taxable real property wholly or partially within its jurisdiction, the San Francisco Bay Area comprising the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma and the City and County of San Francisco. The parcel tax would be assessed for a period of 20 years, from July 1, 2017, through June 30, 2037. According to the Measure, the parcel tax would raise approximately \$25 million annually.

According to the Measure, proceeds would be used to fund shoreline projects to protect and restore San Francisco Bay for future generations by (1) reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins; (2) improving water quality; (3) improving habitat for fish, birds and wildlife; (4) protecting communities from floods; and (5) increasing shoreline access for public enjoyment.

Projects would be prioritized based on criteria set forth in the Measure, including but not limited to, their positive impact on the San Francisco Bay as a whole, in terms of clean water, wildlife habitat, beneficial use to the residents, and ensuring projects are funded in each of the San Francisco Bay Area's nine counties. The Measure ensures allocation of 50% of the funds to

the North Bay, East Bay, South Bay, and West Bay proportional to their populations, with the remaining 50% allocated to projects within the jurisdiction without regard to location.

Proceeds from the parcel tax would be used solely for the programs set forth in the Measure, would be deposited in a separate account, would be spent exclusively for projects in the nine counties comprising the Authority, and could not be taken by the State, with total administrative expenditures limited to no more than 5% of the Measure's proceeds.

An independent, annual audit would be conducted of all proceeds and expenditures, and an annual report would be published detailing the amounts deposited and expended and the status of projects funded under the Measure.

These annual audits and reports would be submitted to an Independent Citizens Oversight Committee for review, with the committee's findings posted on the Authority's website.

The parcel tax would appear as a separate item on residents' property tax bills and would be collected by tax collectors at the same time as and in the same manner as other property taxes.

A "yes" vote is a vote to approve a parcel tax of \$12 per parcel on taxable parcels within the San Francisco Bay Area for a period of 20 years to fund San Francisco Bay restoration projects.

A "no" vote is a vote not to approve a parcel tax of \$12 per parcel on taxable parcels within the San Francisco Bay Area for a period of 20 years to fund San Francisco Bay restoration projects.

This district measure requires 66⅔% affirmative votes to pass.

**The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow.
The full text begins on page 131.**

By:

Kenneth K. Moy
Counsel to the San Francisco Bay Restoration
Authority

Reviewed and revised by Orry P. Korb, County Counsel
for the County of Santa Clara

How "AA" Got on the Ballot

On January 13, 2016, the Governing Board of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority voted 6 to 0 to place Proposition AA on the ballot.

This district measure requires 66⅔% affirmative votes to pass.

**The above statement is an impartial analysis of this measure. Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow.
The full text begins on page 131.**



Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition AA

Join Senator Dianne Feinstein and environmental, business and community leaders from across San Francisco in voting YES on Measure AA for a clean and healthy San Francisco Bay. This measure is critical to restoring wetlands and protecting wildlife habitat for future generations throughout the Bay Area.

San Francisco Bay is a part of all of our lives – whether we live along the Bay; work there; walk, jog, or visit parks along its shores. The Bay also attracts tourists, supports commercial fishing and attracts quality employers to the region – helping keep our economy strong.

But pollution and other problems have put the health of the Bay at serious risk. Fish in the Bay are contaminated with harmful chemicals like PCBs, mercury and pesticides.

Measure AA will restore wetlands throughout the Bay Area, providing habitat for fish and wildlife and filtering out pollutants from water to reduce toxins that threaten the ecosystem. Wetlands also act as a natural barrier against flooding and provide urban recreational open space, a resource we all cherish.

Voting YES on AA will:

- Reduce trash, pollution, harmful toxins in the Bay
- Improve water quality

- Restore habitat for fish, birds, wildlife
- Protect communities from floods
- Increase shoreline public access

Measure AA includes important fiscal accountability protections:

- All funds must stay in the Bay Area and used only on local habitat restoration and wildlife protection projects
- An independent citizens' oversight committee will oversee funds to ensure they are spent properly
- Independent audits and annual public reports ensure transparency

Passing this critical measure will ensure our children and grandchildren inherit a clean and healthy San Francisco Bay. Join us—**vote YES on AA to protect San Francisco Bay**, our greatest natural treasure.
www.yesonaaforthebay.com

Assemblymember Philip Ting

London Breed, President, Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Scott Wiener

Amandeep Jawa, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters

Bob Fisher, Co-Chair, People for a Clean and Healthy Bay

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition AA

We take issue with the proponents' claim that Prop AA has "important fiscal accountability protections." This measure is the height of fiscal irresponsibility by the forced extraction of half a billion dollars from taxpayers **without specific price tags for the jobs to be done.** **Why are there no cost estimates provided so taxpayers can judge what exactly we will be paying for?** **What accountability is there in place to measure how the wetlands have been restored?**

Since SFBRA serves as a distributor of grants with no specific projects with earmarked funds, cronyism and insider politics will determine how the money is doled out—not fiscal worthiness. Already "non-profits" and organizations are lined up at SFBRA's door just waiting for a piece of the lucrative taxpayer pie. This started when SFBRA voted to implement a Project Labor Agreement with the Building Trades Council mandating union labor on all contracts greater than \$100,000 funded by Prop AA. Expect a lot more feeding at the public trough if AA passes.

We also take issue with the proponents' claim that AA "will ensure our children and grandchildren inherit a clean and healthy San Francisco." The only thing we can be absolutely sure of is that we will be paying a lot more bureaucrats and consultants. Since SFBRA staff currently have no funding, a Joint Powers Agreement between SFBRA and the Association of Bay Area Governments specifies reimbursement for staff services if AA passes.

Vote NO on AA.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco

Opponent's Argument Against Proposition AA

Proposition AA is a proposal by the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (SFBRA) that will be on the June 2016 ballots of nine Bay Area counties.

This measure authorizes not only **higher property taxes**, but also **more public debt** without limitation!

This measure is yet another attempt to extract more money from the taxpayers using a noble purpose as bait ("Clean up the bay, woo-hoo!")

But what kinds of things would actually be funded?

"Shoreline cleanup and trash removal" (section 3A1) – Organizations and individuals already do this voluntarily without hitting up the taxpayers. If incentives are needed to encourage further voluntary clean-up efforts, let's allow groups that organize these efforts to have signs posted recognizing their service, as is done with highway clean-up in some places.

"Provide interpretive materials and special outreach events about pollution prevention" (Section A46) – Sounds like a "feel-good" waste of money. How much pollution will "interpretive materials" and "outreach events" really prevent?

Regionalism is promoted as an efficient way of "getting things done". But the price to be paid for cutting corners in this manner is loss of democracy. Voters will have no power to select or to control SFBRA's appointed board members, who would have the kind of money management authority traditionally reserved for elected leaders.

Investing the SFBRA with powers not only to tax and spend but to incur debt which may burden the next generation, sets a troubling precedent. **What will keep other governmental entities in the growing alphabet soup of agencies from acquiring similarly unaccountable powers?**

Communities around the San Francisco Bay can continue to make improvements to the bay's shoreline, wetlands, water quality, and other important assets, without the rash move of writing a blank check to a body that is not answerable to voters. Vote NO on AA.

Libertarian Party of San Francisco
www.LPSF.org

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition AA

If the argument against Measure AA sounds familiar, it's because the authors use the same misinformation against every measure to fund critical public goods, including children's services, health, safety and traffic reduction.

Measure AA is the only way to protect and restore the Bay for future generations – and doesn't increase public debt. Scientists agree that the bay needs 100,000 acres of wetlands to sustain its health for future generations. There are only 44,000 acres of bay wetlands now, but another 30,000 acres are ready to be restored – the only thing missing is funding.

For just \$1 per month, Measure AA provides the reliable local funding necessary to accelerate bay restoration efforts, reducing trash and pollution, expanding habitat for fish, birds and wildlife, and increasing public access for shoreline recreation.

Measure AA includes strict fiscal accountability protections to ensure our taxes go directly to bay wetlands restoration and cannot be taken by Sacramento. An independent oversight committee and annual reports will ensure transparency.

Measure AA doesn't create a new bureaucracy, but instead disperses funding through existing public agencies and non-profit organizations to complete essential wetlands restoration projects. Measure AA could also leverage more state and federal funds for San Francisco Bay, which now receives less federal support than other major U.S. watersheds.

Vote YES on Measure AA to protect and restore our greatest natural treasure and the touchstone of the region we call home – the San Francisco Bay.

Authors:

Senator Mark Leno

Supervisor Jane Kim

Supervisor David Campos

Jim Lazarus, Senior Vice President, San Francisco Chamber

*Lisa Hoyos, Director and Co-Founder Climate Parents**

*For identification purposes only; author is signing as an individual and not on behalf of an organization.

Proposition A

Ordinance amending Ordinance calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 7, 2016, for the purpose of submitting to San Francisco voters a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and County: \$350,000,000 to finance the construction, acquisition, improvement, seismic strengthening and betterment of critical community and mental health, emergency response and safety, and homeless shelter and service facilities animal care facilities for earthquake safety and public health and related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; authorizing landlords to pass-through 50% of the resulting property tax increase to residential tenants in accordance with Administrative Code, Chapter 37; finding that the estimated cost of such proposed project is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such proposed project; fixing the date of election and the manner of holding such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on such bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest; prescribing notice to be given of such election; adopting findings under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), CEQA Guidelines, and Administrative Code, Chapter 31; finding that the proposed bond is in conformity with the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1(b), and with the General Plan, consistency requirement of Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53; consolidating the special election with the general election; establishing the election precincts, voting places and officers for the election; waiving the word limitation on ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code, Section 510; complying with the restrictions on the use of bond proceeds specified in California Government Code, Section 53410; incorporating the provisions regarding the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee in Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36; and waiving the time requirements specified in Administrative Code, Section 2.34.

NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain font.

Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.

Deletions to Codes are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.

Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Findings.

a. This Board of Supervisors (this "Board") recognizes the need to safeguard and enhance the public health and safety in the event of an earthquake by constructing and improving facilities that provide such services to City residents.

b. The Public Health and Safety Bond (the "Bond") will provide funding to acquire, construct, and improve critical public health and safety facilities (as described below in Section 3).

c. This Board now wishes to describe the terms of a ballot measure seeking approval for the issuance of general obligation bonds to finance all or a portion of the City's public health and safety services as described below.

Section 2. A special election is called and ordered to be held on Tuesday, June 7, 2016, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of the City a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City for the project described in the amount and for the purposes stated:

"SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BOND, 2016. \$350,000,000 of bonded indebtedness to finance the cost

of critical public health and safety facilities including essential seismic retrofits and fire response system improvements at the Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center campus, and the renovation and expansion of the Southeast Health Center, the improvement of high-demand community health centers with the expansion of access to mental health, urgent care, substance abuse, dental, and social services; the construction of a seismically safe San Francisco Fire Department Ambulance Deployment Facility, the repair and modernization of neighborhood fire stations Citywide; and the improvement of facilities to better serve homeless individuals and families at homeless shelters and homeless service sites, and the acquisition and construction of related facilities; and to pay related costs, subject to independent citizen oversight and regular audits; and authorizing landlords to pass-through to residential tenants in units subject to Chapter 37 of the Administrative Code (the "Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance") 50% of the increase in the real property taxes attributable to the cost of the repayment of the bonds."

The special election called and ordered shall be referred to in this ordinance as the "Public Health and Safety Bond Special Election."

Section 3. PROPOSED PROGRAM. All contracts that are funded with the proceeds of bonds authorized hereby shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 83 of the Administrative Code (the "First Source Hiring Program"), which fosters construction and permanent employment opportunities for qualified economically disadvantaged individuals. In addition, all contracts that are funded with the proceeds of bonds authorized hereby shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 14B of the Administrative Code (the "Local Business Enterprise and Non-Discrimination in Contracting Ordinance"), which assists small and micro local businesses to increase their ability to compete effectively for the award of City contracts. The proposed program, including Bond proceeds expected to be allocated to each project, can be summarized as follows:

a. PUBLIC HEALTH PROJECT. \$272 million of the Bond shall be allocated to make essential seismic retrofits and improvements at the Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General campus and neighborhood clinic, including but not limited to the modernization of fire response systems and the renovation and addition to the Southeast Health Center, and the improvement of high-demand community health centers with the expansion of access to mental health, urgent care, substance abuse, dental, and social services.

b. SAFETY PROJECT. \$58 million of the Bond shall be allocated to the construction, acquisition, improvement, retrofitting, and upgrade of the San Francisco Fire Department Ambulance Deployment Facility, which includes the construction of a modern, seismically safe ambulance and paramedic deployment facility and for urgently needed repairs and modernizations of neighborhood fire stations Citywide.

c. HOMELESS HEALTH AND SAFETY PROJECT. \$20 million of the Bond shall be allocated to the construction, acquisition, improvement, retrofitting, and upgrading of City-owned homeless shelters and homeless service sites. In addition, a portion of the Bond may be used to acquire and construct facilities to expand homeless services in the City.

d. CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. A portion of the Bond shall be used to perform audits of the Bond, as further described in Section 15.

Section 4. BOND ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES.

The Bond shall include the following administrative rules and principles:

a. OVERSIGHT. The proposed bond funds shall be subjected to approval processes and rules described in the Charter and Administrative Code. Pursuant to Administrative Code 5.31, the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee shall conduct an annual review of bond spending, and shall provide an annual report of the bond program to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

b. TRANSPARENCY. The City shall create and maintain a Web page outlining and describing the bond program, progress,

and activity updates. The City shall also hold an annual public hearing and reviews on the bond program and its implementation before the Board of Supervisors, the Capital Planning Committee, the relevant City commissions, and the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.

Section 5. The estimated cost of the bond financed portion of the project described in Section 2 above was fixed by the Board by Resolution No. 50-16, in the amount of \$350,000,000. Said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board and approved by the Mayor. In such resolution it was recited and found by the Board that the sum of money specified is too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City in addition to the other annual expenses or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs described in this ordinance are by the issuance of bonds of the City not exceeding the principal amount specified.

Such estimate of costs as set forth in such resolution is adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of such bond financed improvements and financing, as designed to date.

Section 6. The Bond Special Election shall be held and conducted and the votes received and canvassed, and the returns made and the results ascertained, determined, and declared as provided in this ordinance and in all particulars not recited in this ordinance such election shall be held according to State law and the Charter and any regulations adopted under State law or the Charter, providing for and governing elections in the City, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by such laws and regulations.

Section 7. The Bond Special Election is consolidated with the General Election scheduled to be held in the City on Tuesday, June 7, 2016. The voting precincts, polling places, and officers of election for the June 7, 2016 General Election are hereby adopted, established, designated, and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places, and officers of election for the Bond Special Election called, and reference is made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places, and officers of election for the June 7, 2016 General Election by the Director of Elections to be published in the official newspaper of the City on the date required under State law.

Section 8. The ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election shall be the ballots used at the June 7, 2016 General Election. The word limit for ballot propositions imposed by Municipal Elections Code Section 510 is waived. On the ballots to be used at the Bond Special Election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear the following as a separate proposition:

"SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY BOND, 2016. "To protect public health and safety, improve community medical and mental health care services, earthquake safety, and emergency medical response; to seismically improve, and modernize neighborhood fire stations and vital public health and homeless service sites; to construct a seismically safe and improved San Francisco Fire Department ambulance deployment facility; and to pay related costs, shall the City and County of San Francisco issue \$350,000,000 in general obligation bonds, subject to citizen oversight and regular audits?"

Each voter to vote in favor of the issuance of the foregoing bond proposition shall mark the ballot in the location corresponding to a "YES" vote for the proposition, and each voter to vote against the proposition shall mark the ballot in the location corresponding to a "NO" vote for the proposition.

Section 9. If at the Bond Special Election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in such proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds authorized shall be issued upon the order of the Board. Such bonds shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding applicable legal limits.

Section 10. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the bonds, the Board shall, at the time of fixing the general

tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of the City, or other account held on behalf of the Treasurer of the City, set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on the bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 11. This ordinance shall be published in accordance with any State law requirements, and such publication shall constitute notice of the Bond Special Election and no other notice of the Bond Special Election hereby called need be given.

Section 12. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, makes the following findings in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., the CEQA Guidelines, 15 California Administrative Code Sections 15000 et seq., ("CEQA Guidelines"), and San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 ("Chapter 31"): Each of the facilities proposed to be funded with this Bond have been reviewed as required by CEQA. Certain programmatic facilities to be constructed or acquired with proceeds of the Bonds, including the neighborhood fire stations, the homeless shelters and service facilities and the high demand community health centers are statutorily exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15273(a)(4). The Environmental Review Officer has determined that the proposed facilities are exempt from CEQA as follows:

a. PUBLIC HEALTH PROJECTS.

1. San Francisco General Hospital Building 5. On April 6, 2015, the Planning Department determined that interior alterations and seismic retrofit of San Francisco General Hospital Building 5 is categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 1 of CEQA Guidelines Section 15301.

2. Southeast Health Center. On June 16, 2015, the Planning Department determined that renovation of and a two-story horizontal addition to the Southeast Health Center (2401 Keith Street) was categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 32 of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332.

3. Community Health Centers. On January 26, 2016, the Planning Department determined that the Bond funding program for the improvement of high demand community health centers across the City and the expansion of access to mental health, urgent care, substance abuse, dental, and social services was statutorily exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15273(a)(4)—establishment of rates, tolls, fares, and charges for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service.

b. SAFETY PROJECT. On December 11, 2015, the Planning Department determined that the demolition of two small structures and construction of a 30,334 gross square foot San Francisco Fire Department ("SFFD") Emergency Medical Services Facility and 62,000 gross square foot parking structure behind SFFD Fire Station No. 9 at 2245 Jerrold Avenue was categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 32 of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332.

c. NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS. On January 26, 2016, the Planning Department determined that the Bond funding program for the modernization and upgrade of San Francisco Fire Department neighborhood fire stations citywide was statutorily exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15273(a)(4)—establishment of rates, tolls, fares, and charges for the purpose of obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas;

d. HOMELESS HEALTH AND SAFETY PROJECT. On January 26, 2016, the Planning Department determined that the Bond funding program for the improvement of facilities to better serve homeless individuals and families at shelters and homeless service sites, and acquisition and construction of related facilities, was statutorily exempt from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15273(a)